DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 623 HE 004 641

AUTHOR	Altbach, Philip G.
TITLE	Comparative Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	RR-5
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	87p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Activism; Bibliographies; *Comparative Education; *Educational Change; Educational Planning; Faculty; Foreign Countries; Governance; *Higher Education; *International Education; *Literature Reviews

ABSTRACT

This report reviews past and present literature relating to comparative higher education. Much of the literature relates to single nations, since cross-national studies have not been performed on a wide scale. The author emphasizes the need for such studies to be made now that sufficient data is generally available. The literature related to a number of areas of concern to higher education is reviewed, including such areas as planning, student activism, faculty, and governance. Higher education reform, a key issue of the 70s, is considered at length. In the final section, the author examines potential directions for future research. The paper includes an extensive bibliography as well as a list of journals that regularly feature articles about comparative higher education. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082623

Comparative Higher Education

Philip G. Altbach

ERIC/Higher Education
Research Report No. 5
1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Prepared by the
ERIC Clearinghouse
on Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

Published by
the American Association
for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D. C. 20036

HE 004 641

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions do not therefore, necessarily represent official views or opinions of either the American Association for Higher Education or the National Institute of Education.

Foreword

This report reviews past and present literature relating to comparative higher education. Much of the literature relates to single nations, since cross-national studies have not been performed on a wide scale. The author emphasizes the need for such studies to be made now that sufficient data is generally available. The literature related to a number of areas of concern to higher education is reviewed, including such areas as planning, student activism, faculty, and governance. Higher education reform, a key issue of the 70s is considered at length. In the final section, the author examines potential directions for future research. The paper includes an extensive bibliography as well as a list of journals that regularly feature articles about comparative higher education. The author, Philip G. Altbach, is Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Wisconsin.

Carl J. Lange, Director
ERIC/Higher Education
The George Washington University

Already Published in the Series

1. Women's Studies: Courses and Programs for Higher Education
   Lora H. Robinson

2. Productivity: Burden of Success
   William Toombs

3. University-City Relations: From Coexistence to Cooperation
   Bernard H. Ross

4. The Integration of Learning and Earning:
   Cooperative Education and Nontraditional Study
   K. Patricia Cross

To subscribe to the complete series of reports (10 issues), write to the Publication Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 200036. The subscription rate for AAHE members is $12; for nonmembers $18. Single issues are available at $2 per copy.

Contents

Overview 1
Research Trends 4
The U.S. as Paradigm for Higher Education 7
Academic Models 11
Areas of Concern in Comparative Higher Education 17
Planning in Higher Education 17
Student Activism 20
The Faculty 23
Governance 26
Research Studies on Comparative Higher Education 30
General and Policy Related Material 32
Higher Education Reform: Key Issue of the Seventies 35
Directions for Future Research 44
Conclusions 46
Bibliography 48

Overview

More than any other institution in society, except perhaps the Roman Catholic Church, universities reflect a very long institutional history and an international consciousness. Further, institutions of higher education face critical and quite similar problems in many nations. Thus, it is surprising that debates concerning the "university crisis" in the U. S. have been notably insular and there has been little use of data, insights, or experiences from abroad. It is the purpose of this essay to indicate that a comparative perspective can add substantially to the discussion of higher education in the U. S. and to point to some of the most relevant issues dealt with in other countries.

In one sense, the U. S. is in the vanguard in terms of responding to some of the most serious problems of higher education, and other countries are moving increasingly in an "American" direction. This is due not only to the political and economic power of the U. S., but to the fact that there is an international current toward ever larger enrollments in institutions of higher education—and the American university was the first to move to a "mass" and now an increasingly "universal" system of postsecondary education (Trow 1972, pp. 61-84). Other countries are now moving, at various speeds, toward "mass" postsecondary systems (Bereday 1973).

At the same time, other countries can provide insights into at least some aspects of the challenges facing American higher education. For one thing, the roots of American higher education lie in Europe, not only in the British "elitist" university, after which Harvard was modeled, but the German universities of the late 19th century, which shaped the American university as we know it today (Ben-David and Zloczower 1968, pp. 45-84; Veysey 1965). Recently, a number of European nations have moved to reform their educational systems in ways that may be of some interest to Americans. For example, the Soviet division between research institutes and "teaching" universities (Jacoby 1971, pp. 33-39), the French "decentralization" under the 1968 reforms (Patterson 1972, pp. 281-302), and, of course, the British Open University (Ferguson 1972, pp. 373-385) are all exciting projects. Ladislav Cerych has written a useful summary of a number of recent European reforms (1972a, pp. 105-119). In short, elements of

institutional transfer occur in higher education, and influences are felt across national boundaries with great regularity (Ashby 1966).

There is no question that the most important international academic influence in the post-World War II period has been that of the U. S., and many American scholars involved themselves in higher education overseas as advisors, researchers, administrators, and professors. It is important for Americans to understand the kind of influence they have had, for all too often academic "foreign aid" is provided with little serious thought to the long-term consequences of such actions, (Altbach 1971, pp. 543-558; Carnoy 1973; Benveniste 1972). American assistance to the University of Nigeria, for example, has affected Nigerian higher education (Hanson 1968), not to mention the more subtle but nonetheless crucial "Americanization" of Europe described by Servan-Schreiber (1968).

Many nations have engaged in educational planning of one kind or another. In the U. S., the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has issued a number of influential reports in the past few years as have a number of ad hoc committees more directly tied to the Federal Government, such as the President's Commission on Campus Unrest (1970). Other countries have also issued reports concerning aspects of higher education, some of which may be relevant to American higher education in a period of stress. For example, the British Robbins Committee report of 1963 is a model of dispassionate, well researched, and highly influential government-sponsored enquiry. The 1966 *Report of the Education Commission* of India (1966) is another well researched document of 700 pages covering all aspects of education in a developing country. A series of UNESCO and OECD reports also constitute valuable research tools for American academic planners.

Finally, a number of innovations in governance and in university state relations undertaken abroad may be relevant to Americans. The well established University Grants Committee in Great Britain (Berdahl 1959) is a mechanism for disbursing government funds to higher education while at the same time insuring a substantial degree of autonomy. This model has been adopted in a number of Commonwealth countries such as Australia, India, and Nigeria, and seems to be effective in these diverse settings. Recent German experiments in the involvement of students in academic governance, the so-called *drittelparitat* formula, have aroused a good deal of controversy in West Germany but are certainly worth studying ("University Reform in Germany" 1970, pp. 242-267). Yugoslav efforts at decentralizing uni-

versity funding and decisionmaking also deserve consideration (Trahan 1973; Institute for Social Research 1970).

Organizational structures, reforms, and planning processes adopted in other countries may have some relevance to the U. S. At the very least, American higher education would understand itself much better if a somewhat broader perspective were taken in the analysis of domestic academic problems. In reality, the American university has taken much in the past from higher education overseas. More recently, it has provided to universities in other countries not only massive funds and technical assistance but the "land-grant model" and emphasis on practical subjects such as agriculture and technology. Such accepted features of the American university as the departmental system and a powerful academic president are major innovations in much of Europe. There is certainly much to be gained by understanding some of the interplay between academic systems, and particularly the relevance of the foreign experience to the American scene. This essay is aimed at providing at least a beginning of such an understanding and a guide to some of the key literature in a rapidly growing yet somewhat ignored area of educational research.

Research Trends

While this essay is concerned with comparative higher education, that is, studies concerning postsecondary education which deal with more than one country and provide specifically comparative insights, the large bulk of the material cited here and in the bibliography which follows relates to single nations and is "comparative" only in the sense that it deals with non-American data. The fact is that truly comparative work in higher education has, for the most part, only recently been undertaken and the literature is as yet quite limited. As consciousness of the interrelatedness of higher education grows, however, more and more studies are undertaken and comparative higher education has become a field of growing relevance in academic circles. The recent work of the International Council for Educational Development under the direction of Dr. James Perkins (Berdahl and Altomare 1972; Cerych 1972b; Ashby 1973) has spurred research. Several international organizations—most notably UNESCO and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—have taken an increasing interest in comparative higher education and have sponsored studies and compilations of statistics on relevant topics. In this regard, the OECD's volume *Development of Higher Education, 1950-1967 Statistical Survey* (1970) and *Analytical Report* (1971) are important sources of information. The Carnegie Commission has sponsored one volume related to higher education outside the U. S. (Burn, Altbach, Kerr, Perkins 1971) among the more than fifty studies it commissioned, indicating perhaps that comparative perspectives play only a limited role in its considerations. To its credit, the Carnegie Commission also sponsored several studies by foreign academics on American higher education and these volumes are quite useful (Ashby 1971; Ben-David 1972; Touraine forthcoming; Nagai forthcoming).

UNESCO's recent series on educational policy in various countries provides valuable analysis of current trends in higher education as well as other aspects of the educational system. These studies have the added advantage of providing a dialogue between UNESCO evaluators and officials from the nation being considered. Relatively few other efforts have been made to provide analysis of relevant aspects of higher education in a cross-national perspective. While national commissions on higher education often include foreigners (particularly in the developing countries), little attention is given specifically to ex-

periences of other countries. An exception to this rule is the valuable "appendix" to the Robbins Commission report from Great Britain that deals with higher education in various countries (Committee on Higher Education 1963, Appendix 5). But, in general, official documents relating to higher education have little cross-national focus.

A number of independent writers have begun to devote attention to comparative dimensions of higher education and have written from a variety of perspectives (Driver 1972; Ashby 1966; Martin 1969; Bockstael and Feinstein 1971; Niblett and Butts 1972; and Niblett 1970). All deal with a range of issues related to higher education. In addition, increasing attention is being given to particular topics in comparative perspective. Student activism, for example, is a topic that aroused much analysis in recent years (Feuer 1969; Lipset and Altbach 1970; Bakke 1972; Archer 1972; Emmerson 1969). More recently, university reform has received some attention in many countries (Altbach 1973). The development of mass and universal systems of higher education has also received recent attention (Bereday 1973; Trow 1972b, pp. 61-84).

There is a fairly long tradition of speculative writing on higher education. Some of the key philosophical works that are still important in discussions of higher education are of a comparative nature—implicitly if not always explicitly. The writings of Ortega y Gasset (1944) and John Henry Newman (1964, orginally published in 1852) remain classics of relevance to higher education in every country. Clark Kerr's volume, *The Uses of the University* (1966), while dealing with the U. S., has been influential abroad because of its concise outline of American trends. One of the first volumes dealing with higher education in a specifically comparative framework was Abraham Flexner's volume, *Universities: American, English, German* (originally published in 1930, republished in 1968 with a new introduction by Clark Kerr). Flexner attacked the "utilitarian" aspects of the American university and praised the devotion of British and German institutions to pure science. It is curious that much of the commentary of the post-World War II period has been in precisely the opposite direction. The early development of universities has received some attention from analysts, and constitutes useful background for those interested in the contemporary scene, since most modern universities stem from the medieval models of Paris (the domination of the faculty) or Bologna (control by students) (Haskins 1957; Schachner 1962).

There are no clearly dominant trends in research on comparative higher education. Much of the present research is directed toward the

solution of immediate and pressing problems, and a significant portion is stimulated by particular crises that occur from time to time—governance, student activism, reform, and others. International and regional organizations are increasingly involved in research on aspects of higher education, and are particularly concerned with research dealing directly with current university problems. A recent OECD study on the economics of higher education is an indication of this interest (OECD, *Economic Aspects of Higher Education* 1964). Individual government agencies as well as academic authorities have been slow to commission studies of comparative aspects of higher education, but there have been some beginnings here also. Concern for specific crisis issues in higher education has stimulated cross-cultural research in several areas, or at least the compilation of studies from many countries relating to the issue. Student activism and university reform are examples of this stimulant to research. In general, the increasingly apparent problems facing universities in all countries and the realization that at least some of these problems are common to many nations will increase the amount and quality of research. At present, there are large gaps in the existing research and no clear direction to the efforts that have taken place in recent years.

The U.S. as Paradigm for Higher Education

Higher education planners and others often look to the U. S. as the most relevant model for academic development in their countries. On the surface at least, it would seem that the American experience has much to offer other countries. Enrollment increases, for example, are common throughout the world, and in fact are often proportionately larger than in the U. S. But since this country was the first nation to achieve a mass system of higher education with some 35 percent of the age group going on for some kind of postsecondary education, nations in which the proportion entering postsecondary education is now increasing from 5 or 8 to 15 percent or more look to the U. S. for a suitable model. And as Ladislav Cerych indicates (1972b), a continual growth trend in most countries of the world is inevitable.

The American experience also seems relevant elsewhere. Many European universities long have been dominated by an elitist ethic and by an organizational structure which makes accommodation to change difficult. At the base of this structure is generally the professorial system by which a single senior faculty member has overwhelming authority over those working with him. In addition, because of the administrative structure of the faculty combined with the power of the individual professors, it has been quite difficult to make room for "new" branches of knowledge or to meet new challenges placed upon the universities. Joseph Ben-David and Awraham Zloczower (1968, pp. 45-84) have provided the context for the development of higher education in Germany, Britain, and the U. S. A common European response to this situation has been to copy the American departmental system, which at least democratizes the faculty and permits younger professors more latitude for innovation and research. It is surprising that Europeans have taken to this aspect of American higher education at the same time that many American reformers have begun to question the department as a proper means of academic organization and several universities, such as the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, have moved away from the department idea.

Other, perhaps less important aspects of American higher education are also emulated by other countries. Student personnel services, for example, are an innovation in nations where academic institutions have traditionally paid no attention to the extracurricular lives of

their students. The concept of the semester, the course-credit system, and continuing assessment and grading are all increasingly popular overseas.

Approximate Enrollment Rates for All Higher Education

Country	Age groups	1950/51	1955/56	1960/61	1965/66	1968/69
Austria (1)	19-24	....	3.0	4.5	6.4	8.3
Belgium	18-23	4.0*	5.4	8.0	11.0	13.7*
Denmark	19-25	5.0	5.4	7.7	9.6	10.9
Finland	19-24	4.2	5.5	7.1	10.2	14.0*
France	18-23	4.8*	6.0	8.7	12.5	13.9
Germany	20-25	3.8	4.4	5.8	8.3	9.0**
Greece	18-24	....	1.9	2.8	6.5	7.65*
Ireland	18-22	3.9*	4.6*	7.3	8.0*	10.0*
Iceland	.....	....	....	....	....	....
Italy (2)	19-25	4.2	4.1	5.5	8.7	10.0
Japan	18-22	4.9	7.1	8.1	12.0	14.1
Luxembourg (3)	20-25	....	....	3.8	6.1	....
Netherlands	18-24	4.4	5.2	7.4	8.6	9.0
Norway	19-24	3.4*	3.1*	5.0*	8.7	9.4*
Portugal	18-24	1.4	1.7*	2.5	3.6	5.7**
Spain	18-24	....	2.6*	3.8	6.0	7.1*
Sweden	20-24	4.8	6.3	8.6	12.6	16.9**
Switzerland	20-25	4.5	4.5	5.5	6.6	7.1**
Turkey	18-23	1.0*	1.3*	2.3	3.2	4.4**
United Kingdom	18-22	5.2*	6.3*	8.7	10.7	13.5*
Yugoslavia	19-25	2.7	2.9	6.1	9.2	11.5**
Canada (4)	18-23	6.5*	8.1	13.6	18.9	28.0**
United States	18-23	16.8	21.1	25.9	31.4	35.0

(1) Austrian students only.
(2) 1951, 1956, 1961 and 1966.
(3) 1960 and 1966.
(4) 1951, 1956, 1961 and 1965.
* Estimate of enrollments.
** Estimate of age group.
Source: *Towards New Structures of Post-Secondary Education* (Paris: OECD 1971).

On the other hand, some elements of academic systems in other countries are being adopted in the U. S., again usually with relatively little assessment of the nature of those practices overseas. For example, the use of centralized examinations for college entrance and other pur-

poses (such as the CEEB or ACT examinations) has been common in Japan for many years with what many people, including many Japanese observers, have seen as detrimental results (Passin 1965). The rise of examinations as a criteria of academic success has been called by some the "Japanization" of American higher education. And with the increasing use of pass-fail options at the undergraduate level, it is possible that centralized examinations will be increasingly relied upon for assessment of academic success in the U. S. And, as has been noted earlier, it is important to examine foreign influences in earlier periods of American higher education to fully understand the nature of contemporary American higher education (Veysey 1965; Ben-David and Zloczower 1968, pp. 45-84).

The question of why American patterns of higher education have had so much influence overseas is an important one to ask. The answer lies basically in two general areas. The first is that the U. S. is the first post-industrial nation and a growing number of nations, particularly in Western Europe, are moving toward this phase of their socioeconomic development. America as well as other countries are faced with very high demand for higher education, the need to provide increasingly high levels of training for growth proportions of the labor force, and the emergence of higher education, in the public mind at least, as a key element in individual social mobility. All of these elements have provided a powerful impetus for the expansion of higher education in the United States. Further, large amounts of money have been made available to the universities for both expansion and for curricular and other changes that would provide a society with both training and research in emerging technologies—from aerospace engineering to ecology.

The second major reason for the impact of American patterns of higher education overseas is America's political and economic power throughout the world. Not only is the U. S. a wealthy and technologically advanced nation, and therefore a natural model to other countries, but the large amount of foreign aid in terms of educational assistance and advice provided to developing countries by the U. S. is a very strong influence. American universities have been deeply involved in assisting institutions of higher education in other countries (Gardner 1964; Altbach 1971, pp. 543-558), and it is common that the models provided by American planners are similar to those found in the U. S. The land-grant model, for example, has been exported to a number of countries (Hanson 1968), as have American programs in agricultural education (Hannah 1966). Americans have served as ad-

visors to many governments, and have, for example, pressed Indian universities to adopt the semester system and internal assessment as parts of their academic programs. The many thousands of individuals from the developing countries who have studied in the U. S. also take back with them elements of the American academic ethos, although their impact at home has not been adequately studied (Eisemon 1973). And, of course, the whole "braindrain" question is an element in the interrelationship between academic systems in many countries (Myers 1972). One can see in American educational relations with other countries a combination of the normal attraction of a powerful metropolitan nation and what some have called neocolonialism—the direct influence for reasons of policy of the U. S. on the developing areas. But it is clear that there are very strong relationships between the U. S. and other countries, both in Europe and the developing countries, and that while the balance of influence is from the U. S. to other countries, there is some weight in the other direction as well.

Academic Models

While universities can be traced to their common roots in the medieval period, there are many differences among higher educational institutions around the world. In this section, some of the important variations in university models will be indicated and an effort made to indicate the reasons for some of these differences. It is almost a truism to state that universities develop as a part of their national environments as well as participants in an international academic subculture. The relationship between an academic institution and its surrounding society is a particularly important one. Eric Ashby (1964 and 1966) pioneered a discussion of the impact of society on university and of the "ecology"—both national and international—of the academic world.

The two medieval models of universities—the Paris "faculty" model and the Bologna "student" model—provided the early organizational focus of higher education and remain important even today. Without question, the Paris model was the dominant one (Haskins 1965) throughout most of the world, with the possible exception of Spain and Latin America, where some elements of the Bologna model remain. The University of Paris stressed the key role of the faculty in deciding matters of curriculum, style of teaching, and in setting standards for admission and graduation. Universities were, even in the earliest stages, far from so-called ivory tower institutions and were very much engaged in both professional education and the affairs of their societies. The University of Paris faculty, for example, was very much involved in theological disputes (Rashdall 1936). The University of Bologna was founded largely to provide training in law, while Paris was closely tied to education for the Church as well as law and medicine.

The British variation of the Paris model, in the form of Oxford and Cambridge, exhibited some differences which were important to the U. S., since the college model came to North America by way of Britain. The British saw higher education not only as a means of professional training for theology, law, and medicine, but as a means of training an elite. Thus, Oxford and Cambridge were interested not only in the curriculum of higher education but in "character building." From this concern, the notion of *in loco parentis* was developed. Based

on this British model, early American colleges were much concerned with the character of the student as well as his intellectual development. From its beginning, Harvard was very much concerned both with the education of an elite and with insuring that students were exposed to sanctioned values.

The British college model is a very important one; not only did it shape early American higher education, but it had a profound impact on the areas of the world subject to British colonial domination, including Canada and Australia as well as developing areas like Nigeria and India. Ashby's (1966) unexcelled discussion of the transfer of British academic norms from the metropole to various parts of the world makes clear the worldwide impact of British higher education. Of course, the Oxbridge model did not rule supreme even in England —the University of London, for example, provided the actual model for higher education in India in the mid-19th century although the ethos of Oxbridge remained strong. And more recently the "redbrick" (Truscot 1951) and the newer "plateglass" (Beloff 1968) universities have marked more drastic shifts from the traditional model. It is significant, too, that strong elements of the British academic model and ethos remained in American higher education well into the 19th century. Harvard itself was dragged into the 20th century only after seeing that newer "upstarts" such as Chicago and Johns Hopkins were proving successful (Veysey 1965).

The other foreign academic model which is important from the American viewpoint is that of the German university of the late 19th century. The German university of this period pioneered in the development of scientific research in the university and developed graduate training. Its concepts of *lernfreiheit* and *lehrfreiheit* provided the basis for academic freedom. Faculties were given unprecedented freedom, funds, and prestige and moved to the frontiers of scientific research and advancements (Veysey 1965; Ben-David 1965; Ben-David and Zloczower 1968, pp. 45-81). For a period in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a large proportion of Americans at the top of the academic profession were trained in Germany. This fact had a profound influence on American higher education. At the turn of the century, several new universities were founded to reflect the German model—beginning with an abortive attempt at Clark University and then the more successful efforts at Johns Hopkins, Chicago, and Stanford. The traditional leaders, Harvard and Yale, followed somewhat later. The rise of graduate education accompanied by a research orientation in American higher education and a strengthening of the departmental

system as the appropriate division of knowledge were key elements in the shaping of the modern American university. The professionalization of the faculty was also important at this period. The German model had effects in other parts of the world—very directly in the traditional spheres of German cultural influence in Central and Eastern Europe and more indirectly in France and Great Britain. But the U. S. was shaped in an unprecedented way by the German university.

Another innovation in academic life important in shaping American higher education and later in influencing higher education in the developing areas is the land-grant concept, exemplified nowhere so dramatically as at the University of Wisconsin (Curti and Carstenson 1949). It combined a research orientation with direct service to the state and an unprecedented sensitivity to social needs. It also marked strong government involvement in funding of higher education. The major state universities were, of course, centers of both the land-grant philosophy and of the practical application of this philosophy, and American private higher education was also influenced by it. More recently, this uniquely American contribution of academic life has had a direct impact in the developing countries, where American foreign aid and technical assistance fostered institutions of higher education modelled directly on the American state universities; and more indirectly in Europe, where the American commitment to public service and involvement with business and agriculture slowly have had an effect on European universities.

The Soviet Union also provides a somewhat unique academic model that is basically in the shape of the research institutes set up on a wide scale (Jacoby 1971, pp. 33-39). The Soviets have made an effort to divorce pure and applied research from the usual teaching processes of the universities, and this marks an innovation in the organization of higher education. In addition, while the more traditional Soviet universities have a structure similar to those found in other parts of the world—and particularly close to the classical German tradition—Soviet authorities pay very close attention to the control of potentially dissident elements within the university, and there is substantially more control and supervision by government over higher education than in most other countries. Thus, the Soviet Union may provide some guidance to nations concerned with maintaining strong control over higher education for either political or academic reasons (Rosen 1963; Onushkin 1971, pp. 61-172). It is perhaps significant that many of the Eastern European countries have not completely adopted the Soviet model in higher education, although elements of it exist in most coun-

tries. Czechoslovakia and Hungary, for example, retain much of the traditional German influence in their universities, with power and prestige retained by the senior faculty.[1] China, after some experiments with the Soviet model, turned sharply away from it and has been engaging in various educational experiments (Bastid 1970, pp. 16-45).

There are a number of important differences between universities in the advanced and in the developing countries, and since the U. S. has had much involvement with the developing areas and many students from these countries study here, it is important to consider them. As Ashby (1966) and others have pointed out, the large majority of universities in developing countries are creatures of colonialism. When the colonial powers established institutions of higher learning in their colonies, they did so with specific aims. In general, they wanted to train mid-level bureaucrats to facilitate the colonial administration and to create a class of loyal colonial cadres. An unanticipated result of this colonial policy was, of course, the creation of articulate nationalists (McCully 1940) who eventually had a role in the downfall of the colonial regime. But in another sense, colonial education was successful in that it did create a class of educated people who functioned in the colonial language (usually English or French), had many of the intellectual and political values of the metropolitan power, and who worked hard to retain the kind of educational institutions familiar to them once independence came. For the most part, these colonially trained elites were successful in maintaining European-oriented universities, often continuing to use the metropolitan language as the medium of instruction. In no developing country are the major institutions of higher learning substantially different from those found in Europe or more recently the United States. China and to some extent Tanzania are the only countries which have tried to any major extent to diverge from established academic patterns (Seybolt 1972, pp. 29-41; Chun Wang 1969-70, pp. 27-52).

In part as a result of historical circumstance and in part as a result of the current policies of both advanced and developing nations, a strong relationship continues in the area of higher education. Advanced research is, for the most part, produced in the advanced nations and consumed in the developing countries. Even textbooks in many fields are imported. Academics in developing countries often look to the former metropole for recognition and guidance. And, of course,

---

[1]There is no adequate discussion of higher education in Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia is the only nation about which there is reasonably complete information available. (See Filipovic 1971.)

many students from developing countries study in the advanced nations and absorb the values and orientations of the institutions at which they take their advanced degrees. Thus, a kind of client-patron relationship is maintained despite the formal independence of developing countries. Even when reforms are planned, they are often based on models provided by the advanced nations even when the experiences are quite different from those in the developing areas. The introduction of American-style land-grant colleges in a number of countries is an example of this orientation. It should be noted, however, that these colleges have been successful in some of the areas in which they have been implanted. The personnel for powerful commissions on university development and reform often include educators from the advanced countries. Nigeria and India are cases in point. It is clear that the relationship between universities in developing and advanced nations is a complex one and one that has major implications for the intellectual and academic development of the developing nations.

As has been indicated in this discussion of academic models, there are patterns of higher education with a great deal of influence cross-nationally over the years. No university is a product of a "pure" academic model, and the trend is toward more hybridization among institutions of higher learning. In addition, dominant models change. During periods of history, the Paris, Oxbridge, German, and American academic models have been influential. And as academic planners become more sophisticated and research on higher education expands, universities are increasingly careful about the kinds of academic models adopted. There is a strong trend to utilize elements of various university systems as they are relevant to a nation's particular needs.

It is also important to recall that universities have not always been at the center of intellectual life of nations as they are at the present time. When institutions of higher education have failed to adapt to changing circumstances or have been prevented from doing so, they have ceased to be key institutions. For example, most of the major scientific discoveries and innovations which paved the way for the industrial revolution in England did not take place in the universities. They were conducted by independent individuals, often loosely affiliated with the Royal Academy. The universities of the period were engaged in training clergymen and were unwilling to change to accommodate scientific knowledge, and in the process were simply passed over by the intellectual currents of that time. Similarly, the French universities had little role in the period of France's greatest intellectual influence. Cultural and intellectual life had few institutional

links at this time. The intellectual eminence of the German universities was ended by the Nazis in a very short period of time simply by rigidly controlling academic institutions and dictating particular intellectual and academic policies. Within a few years, the German universities became intellectual shells. In short, universities are delicate institutions that must tread a narrow path between total academic autonomy and completely ignoring society at large on the one hand and submission to the whims of often narrowly perceived social interests on the other.

Areas of Concern in Comparative Higher Education

A number of issues stand out as particularly important for Americans seeking to broaden their perspectives on higher education. This section highlights these areas and considers the relevant literature. The modest extent of available literature in some areas is indicative of current trends in the field and the need for additional research.

Planning in Higher Education

National or regional planning has been undertaken in many nations, usually by governments but occasionally by private agencies, foundations, individual universities, or international bodies like UNESCO. The plans vary substantially in quality and scope, and range from brief considerations of quite specific issues, such as the development of student services, to documents of hundreds of pages reflecting a broad approach to higher education and a concern for effective long-range planning. Most planning documents relate to particular problems raised by governments, universities, or simply by the force of events. Substantial demand for places in universities force the academic community to reluctantly increase the size and/or number of universities. A commission is set up to consider the most effective way of doing this, and the result of this commission is a plan for higher education in that particular country (or state or region). Student activism in recent years has stimulated the planning process in a number of countries including the U. S. Increasing government concern over the nature and effectiveness of educational expenditures has also contributed substantially to the planning process. For the most part, documents are prepared by government agencies or with government financial support. The United States is not without planning and reports on higher education, although American planning reflects the decentralized nature of the university system. While the Federal Government has undertaken some inquiries into higher education (the Newman report, for example), most planning is done at the state or local level or by private agencies. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education is, without question, one of the largest planning and evaluative efforts in the history of higher education in any country. Its multivolume research reports and its recommendations in many

areas of higher education are a monumental effort. Many individual universities in the United States have undertaken their own plans and evaluations, and the difficulty in obtaining these reports constitutes one small problem for academic decisionmakers which could be easily solved. Several states, most notably California and New York, have also engaged in large scale and effective planning to assess their own educational needs and to take steps to meet those needs.

Canada and Great Britain are perhaps closest to the United States not only in language and culture, but in their academic ethos. This is particularly true for Canada, which has been following the United States quickly into an era of "mass" higher education. Several reports deal with Canadian higher education in a period of great change (Hurtubise and Rowat 1970; Commission on Relations Between Universities and Governments 1968; and Duff and Berdahl 1966). The influential Duff-Berdahl report dealt specifically with university governance. Most of the Canadian provinces have produced planning documents. One of the most importance has been published recently by Ontario (*The Learning Society* 1972).

One of the most influential commission reports of the post-World War II period is the famous Robbins Committee report, which made recommendations for sweeping changes in British higher education (Committee on Higher Education 1963). The Robbins Committee's multiple volume report is a model of thoroughness and provided the blueprint for the expansion of British higher education in the 1960s. The British have made particularly effective use of blue-ribbon commissions to investigate aspects of higher education, and these reports have had wide influence on policy and practice. More recently, a Commission headed by Lord Rothschild dealt with science policy and another chaired by Lord James made wide ranging recommendations concerning teacher education. The reports of the various official commissions usually arouse widespread discussion in journals such as the *Times Higher Education Supplement* and elsewhere. One particularly good analysis of the impact of the Robbins Committee was edited by Richard Layard *et al.* (1969). Other analyses of the effectiveness of planning in Great Britain can be found in a book edited by Tyrrell Burgess (1972a) and in several incisive articles (McConnell and Berdahl 1971, pp. 3-22; and Perkin 1972, pp. 111-120). There have been a number of volumes reporting on higher education planning at the local level in Britain. Michael Beloff's (1968) volume deals with the newer universities generally, while David Daiches' book (1964) considers a single new university, Sussex, in its period of growth.

Following the British model, a number of the Commonwealth countries have engaged in academic planning exercises through official commissions often with the assistance of British academies. An Australian commission produced an influential report in 1957, while various African nations have engaged in large-scale academic planning with varying degrees of success (*Higher Education in East Africa* 1958; *Report of the Commission on Higher Education in West Africa* 1945; *Report of the Commission on University Education* (Ghana) 1961; and others). C. A. Anderson (1968-9, pp. 36-51) has provided a thoughtful analysis of the planning process in East Africa. India has been particularly active in analysing and planning for its higher educational system. Commissions dating back to 1919 have made official enquiries. The most recent, and certainly the most thorough analysis of Indian education, was conducted by the Education Commission (1964-66). P. G. Altbach (1972a, pp. 251-267) provides an overview of some of the other reports and the difficulties encountered in implementing many of the often quite sound recommendations. The Indian case is a particularly dramatic example of a common situation—the inability of governmental or academic authorities to implement carefully formulated plans for higher education. The reasons for this failure to implement plans are manifold—expense (particularly in developing countries), political factors, inertia from elements of the academic community, and others. Some plans have been successfully implemented. For example, the Ashby Commission on higher education in Nigeria was put into effect by the Nigerian government (Fafunwa and Hanson 1973).

Other efforts to analyze the planning process in higher education concentrating on official documents can be found in Victor Onushkin's useful volume (1971), which deals with both Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Problems of academic planning in Poland and in Yugoslavia are discussed in articles which focus attention on societies in which substantial centralization of economic and social resources is available (Matejko 1969, pp. 621-648; Trahan 1973). Academic planning in Japan, a nation that has seen many outside influences on its universities, is discussed in several volumes (Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai 1972; Blewett 1965). The Japanese universities prior to World War II patterned themselves largely on the German model but after the war many elements of the American system were imposed on them. The impact of post-war expansion, major alterations in the curriculum, and a shift to a more American, "practical" orientation from the former pre-World War II German model has been crucial to academic

life in Japan (Nagai 1971). A recent OECD report focuses on Japan's educational problems and the difficulties in adequately planning for what has become a very large and diverse academic system (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development 1971c, pp. 69-160). A series of analyses of European efforts to diversify higher education through planning can be found in a recent issue of *"Diversifying Postsecondary Education in Europe"* (1972). A new journal, *Higher Education*, is devoted to issues of higher education planning (Lockwood 1972, pp. 409-434) as well as to a myriad of other topics.

The documents referred to in this section differ markedly in their theoretical conceptions, approaches to the problem, scope, and the effectiveness of the ends they achieve. They have in common a commitment by academic or governmental authorities to investigate a situation so that changes can come about in an orderly manner. For both the analyst and policymaker, the planning efforts made by various nations provide a particularly useful perspective from which to examine alternative methodologies for planning and alternative planning models.

Student Activism

Without question, student activism has been one of the most widely discussed and volatile issues in higher education in almost every country. Not only have students seriously disrupted academic life in many nations and toppled governments in a few others, but they have stimulated much research and have in a few instances focused attention on the need for university reform or other measures to alleviate problematic situations. The literature on student activism in various countries is substantial. P. G. Altbach's (1970b) bibliography provides the most thorough overview of the available literature. Some of the most useful materials of a cross-cultural nature are highlighted here. The nature of activism differs substantially from country to country. An issue which may bring students into the streets in Tokyo may not cause unrest in London. In some countries, students are concerned very much with academic questions, while in others the focus of activism is overwhelmingly political.

Research on student activism is perhaps best developed in the U. S. (Altbach and Kelly 1973), in contrast to many other nations where studies have not been extensively performed. Despite this fact, there is much research on student activism from a cross-cultural perspective, and a number of useful edited volumes that deal with students in a variety of countries (Feuer 1969; Lipset and Altbach 1970; Emmerson

1968; Archer 1972; Bakke and Bakke 1972; Lipset 1967; Spender 1969; Ehrenreich 1969). There is no adequate theory about student activism, although several analysts have tried to provide wide-ranging, cross-cultural analyses. Feuer and Bakke have been most ambitious in this regard, and neither has produced a theory that can account for more than a small number of activist movements. Feuer's concept of generational conflict is of limited usefulness, as are theories that place all stress on ideological politics or on dissatisfaction with the *status quo*. Weinberg and Walker (1969, pp. 77-96) and Frank Pinner (1972, pp. 281-296) make an effort to provide some typologies for student activism as does P. G. Altbach (1967, pp. 74-94; 1970c, pp. 333-357), and these considerations provide some useful generalizations. The fact remains, however, that student activism in any particular country must be analyzed not only in terms of general political or sociological theory, but very much in the light of particular local and national circumstances.

It is possible to state that as a general rule student activism is not the result of discontent with academic situations only, although it is certainly the case that student unrest can result in part from academic issues. In India, where academic conditions are particularly dismal (Altbach 1969), agitation occurs for academic reasons only, but they are often linked to other factors as well. The French student revolt of May-June 1968, one of the most dramatic upsurges of student activism in recent years, was sparked not only by underlying discontent with campus conditions but also in the main by broader political factors (Touraine 1971; Schnapp and Vidal-Naquet 1971). Activism usually occurs as a result of a complex of issues, not all of which are readily apparent by examining the immediate cause of the unrest. Even the Berkeley student revolt of 1964, which was precipitated by the imposition of a university rule concerning campus political organizing, had as background a variety of issues ranging from the Vietnam war to the civil rights movement to perceived deficiencies in undergraduate education at Berkeley (Heirich, 1971). While the motivations of students in various countries differ and of course circumstances have wide variations, it is nevertheless possible for American observers to gain insights from the experiences of other countries.

It is perhaps significant that British students, while active in politics from time to time, have not engaged in the type of widespread militant activism as has been the case in Europe and the U. S. Many factors account for the nature of British student activism, not the least of which is the nature of the British political culture. British universities, de-

spite expansion in recent years, still maintain fairly good academic conditions. It is also important to recall that the Labor Party was in power in Britain during the period of militant activism and this party maintained at least some student ties (Halsey and Marks 1970, pp. 35-59; Martin 1970; Ashby and Anderson 1970). The two other nations hardest hit by student activism in Europe are France and West Germany, where the student-led "extra-parliamentary opposition" was a key political force in the mid 1960s (Merritt 1969, pp. 516-532; "Relentless Revolutionaries" 1968, pp. 690-739; Sontheimer 1968, pp. 49-87; Goldschmidt 1972, pp. 154-166). In these two countries, and also in the U. S., the height of student activism coincided with a political situation where there was only weak opposition and where the government was engaged in unpopular actions. In the U. S., the period after Lyndon Johnson's unprecedented electoral victory and the escalation of the Vietnam war marked a highpoint of student activism. Japan is another industrialized nation with a history of student activism where students played a key political role in the 1960s (Dowsey 1970; Shimbori 1968, pp. 204-228; Shimbori 1963, pp. 59-70).

It is significant that student movements in developing areas have been most successful in the broader political sphere—they have toppled governments in South Korea, Turkey, and other countries and are considered to be important elements of the political culture in many other nations. There are also marked differences between student movements in advanced nations and emerging nations. For one thing, students consider themselves an "incipient elite" and are looked on as future national leaders. Due to the lack of other vocal political elements, students assume a more important role in society. This is especially true because students are often concentrated in the capital city and are easy to mobilize for political activism (Altbach 1970, pp. 333-357; Emmerson 1968). Because the political, economic, and educational situations are so different in the developing areas, they provide fewer useful lessons for Americans seeking to understand student activism and its role in academic life.

Student activism has stimulated university reform in a number of countries despite the fact that the main focus of the militant students was not on the university at all. Indeed, with the possible exception of West Germany (Nitsch 1965), activists have developed few concrete blueprints for academic reform, and activist concern with higher education has generally been in the form of specific and general complaints against the universities but with few suggestions for improvements. Student unrest triggers reform mainly because the atten-

tion focused on the universities convinces public opinion and government authorities that steps must be taken to insure order on campus and in society, and it is much easier to change aspects of the university than it is to broadly deal with social ills. Thus, in West Germany, the student activism of the 1960s spurred academic reforms at a number of universities, beginning with the Free University of Berlin, scene of some of the most militant demonstrations. In France, the reform laws of 1968 were initiated in large part in response to the challenge of student unrest although the radical students had nothing to do with the formulation of the measures and, in fact, opposed them. Similarly, the Japanese government was moved to pay unprecedented attention to the universities as a result of student activism (Nagai 1971). The surge of American concern for university reform and the appointment of a number of high-level commissions were due in large measure to a need to respond to the student activism of the 1960s.

The Faculty

Professors are at the heart of the academic institution although until recently they have received very little attention from researchers. Recently, there has been a recognition that little change can take place in higher education if the faculty is an implacable enemy of change, and that the faculty must somehow be considered in any proposals for change. Even a simple understanding of the teaching-learning situation and the progress of research depends in no small measure on the nature and orientation of the faculty. Research on this topic is probably most advanced in the U. S., particularly with the recent survey of professors conducted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (Lipset and Ladd 1973); but studies are being undertaken in other countries as well, as a realization of the importance of professors becomes clearer.

The reasons for lack of research about the academic profession are significant and reflect some of the broader reasons for the paucity of data on comparative higher education generally. Academics have been notably reluctant to study themselves or their own institutions, perhaps fearing sanctions if research indicated negative aspects of this profession. Most of those engaged in studies in comparative higher education are in the social sciences and, until quite recently, most social scientists regarded the universities as peripheral institutions in society, or at least felt that other forces—trade unions, business enterprises, the military, for example—were more worthy of study than universities. This has changed somewhat as it has become clear that uni-

versities are important institutions in most societies, and since they have moved to the center of public and governmental concern in many countries. Finally, there has been very little "theoretical" work on the academic profession, although some of the research on professions in general applies to academics. It has been difficult to develop usable categories and theoretical concerns in this area, and few have attempted to do this (Gouldner 1957, 1958; see also Baldridge 1971). Almost all of the general analysis that has been done has concerned individual countries and is not readily applicable cross-culturally. While some research is now being conducted on academics in various countries, there has been little effort to develop broader theoretical concepts to apply specifically to the cross-cultural study of professors.

There is little argument that the academic profession is a key area for consideration in any analysis of higher education in any country. Not only can the faculty effectively block reform efforts, frustrate administrators and government officials, and in general act conservatively to protect their own interests or preserve values they think important, but the faculty in many ways sets the tone for a university. Such factors as the self-image of the professoriate in a particular university or in a nation as a whole, the social origins of the academic profession, the links between professors and the government, and other matters are all important areas for research and components of the world-view of the faculty. If the academics are predisposed to an "oppositional" mentality vis-a-vis the government, they can be a powerful force for dissent in the society and can stimulate student agitation easily. The views of the academic profession concerning the nature of higher education generally, the role of the university in society, the proper function of research and scholarship, and other seemingly esoteric matters are also important. For example, if there are very well-developed views concerning university autonomy among the faculty and strong academic leadership, it is often possible for a common viewpoint to emerge to protect this autonomy. The University of Ghana's fairly successful refusal to follow the recommendations of the Nkrumah government on matters of academic policy is a particularly dramatic example here. Where there is little consensus on such matters, as seems to be the case in India, the universities have been less able to defend themselves.

While there are common threads of academic culture evident in most countries, it is not known just how similar are the attitudes and values of academics cross-culturally, and just how much of an international academic culture really exists. The only full-scale studies that can be

usefully compared in this matter are those undertaken by the Carnegie Commission in this country (Lipset and Ladd 1973) and by A. H. Halsey and M. Trow in Great Britain (1971). More comparative information on qualifications for academics (Is the Ph.D. or its equivalent necessary for employment or advancement?), the role of research, the attitudes of the professoriate concerning politics, the nature of higher education, governance, and other matters is badly needed. There is no doubt that substantial differences do exist from country to country on most of these issues. The traditional Latin American academic, for example, is a part-time professor, holding several jobs and often teaching only a few hours a week. Clearly there is no strong commitment to the university or a sense of a professional commitment to scholarship under these conditions (Pelczar 1972, pp. 230-250). In Japan, academic salaries are often so low that professors must hold several teaching positions at once, and thus their commitment to a single institution is low. On the other hand, the prestige of the academic profession in such countries as Great Britain and, to a decreasing extent, West Germany, is very high and remuneration is generally sufficient to provide for a middle- or upper-middle-class life style.

Of the information available concerning the professoriate, the OECD (1971) has provided a quantitative survey of the academic profession in OECD member countries (Western Europe, North America, and Japan), while the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers has compiled a volume on the status of the academic profession in a number of countries (Shryock 1961). Edward Shils (1969, pp. 345-372) provides some useful analysis of the academic profession in India, while Irene Gilbert (1972, pp. 384-411) has added some data of a historical nature on Indian professors. Several analysts have written of other aspects of the Indian professor and his problems (Altbach 1972b; Gaudino 1965; Ross 1968, pp. 89-100). Thus India, with its large cadre of college and university teachers, has received a good deal of attention. In general, India is an example of a developing nation in which the professor does not have either high status or high income; and with a few notable exceptions, usually in prestigious graduate departments, academics have little influence or self-esteem.

Great Britain has also seen some analysis of its academic profession. A. H. Halsey and Martin Trow's (1971) sociological study of the British professoriate is one of the most thorough analyses available in any country. Several historical studies of aspects of the British academic profession are also available, and these provide useful and, for most

countries, rare insights into the changing status of academics and their role in university and society (Rothblatt 1968; Perkin 1969a). German academia has been considered by Alexander Busch (1963,pp. 319-341). The German professoriate was also the subject of substantial controversy during the student activism of the 1960s, when many accused the traditional chair holders of arrogance and an unwillingness to change. These criticisms had some effect, since the position of the professors has suffered under recent reforms. Michiya Shimbori has been the most sensitive observer of the academic profession in Japan (1964, pp. 284-296; 1969, pp. 617-639). Shimbori describes a professional structure much different from that familiar to the U. S., a structure that permits little mobility from institution to institution and promotes sponsorship of junior academics by powerful senior professors.

Joseph Ben-David, in several of his articles, has dealt with professors as scientific innovators and as key elements in the rise of scientific endeavors in the universities (1960, pp. 828-843; 1965, pp. 15-54; 1968-9, pp. 3-35). Ben-David stresses that there must be a combination of social acceptance and support, institutional receptiveness, and individual initiative in the academic profession to produce the "spark" that promotes good research. Eric Ashby has also provided a general discussion on this topic (1970, pp. 90-99).

As is clear from this summary of the scope of the literature on the academic profession, the available material is incomplete, lacks comprehensive geographical coverage, and even for those countries where some material does exist, there is seldom full data available concerning the topic. Thus, the need for research on almost all aspects of the academic profession is particularly great, both from the viewpoint of individual countries and from a cross-national perspective.

Governance

Without question, the organization of universities has much to do with their effective functioning, their role, and their ethos. Recently, the term "governance" has been used to describe the ways in which universities are managed and organized. Such factors as the structures of decisionmaking within an academic institution, the roles of various participants in the academic community (faculty, administrators, and occasionally students) have in its functioning, and the general effectiveness of these structures in the way in which the institution works are included under the the theme of governance. As with some other aspects of higher education research, consideration of governance both from a theoretical viewpoint and in terms of practical proposals for

change have been pioneered recently in the U. S. Most of this material has no mention at all of non-American situations, although the recently published report of the Carnegie Commission on governance (1972) does have an appendix that discusses some recent reforms at Cambridge University in Great Britain.

The best general overview of many of the issues involved with governance can be found in the volume edited by J. V. Baldridge (1971). Many of the insights in this volume come from the social sciences, and particularly from sociology (especially organizational theory), political science, and to some extent from scholars in educational administration, who apply elements of the social sciences to educational institutions. Few analyses of higher education can completely avoid questions of governance, since the structure and organization of the university is a key element in its operation and in the understanding of any aspect of its functioning. For example, the rather unique American system of lay trustees or regents for universities means that nonacademic decisionmakers are at the pinnacle of power in the university. Europeans may be surprised by the direct power of lay trustees, while Americans find it difficult to understand the direct involvement of government agencies such as ministries of education and finance in the operation of the universities.

Several authors have been concerned with a structural overview of academic institutions, although few have dealt with this topic cross-nationally (Ashby 1973; Perkins 1972a, and 1973). These volumes treat governance as a general issue, and seek to generalize on the nature of academic government. Some of the theoretical writings, cited above, also include such considerations. Eric Ashby has dealt with the "model" of the 19th century university and its relevance for today (1967, pp. 3-17), while Barbara Burn has contrasted four different national models of higher education in an effort to point out similarities and differences (1973, pp. 79-106). The issue of how to alter academic models to suit university systems which are rapidly expanding has also been considered (Ross 1972, pp. 363-366), while Bruce Williams (1972, pp. 259-279) has written about the congruence between university values and university organization. A. K. Rice has provided one of the few comprehensive models for academic reorganization based in part on his experience in India and in part on general considerations (1970).

Specific national experiences are considered in a number of studies, and individual universities around the world have sponsored studies on governance. It is estimated that more than one hundred such re-

ports, often stressing changes in the pattern of governance, have been been published in Japan alone in the past decade (Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai 1972), and a similar number have appeared in the U. S. Many of the West German states (which have basic responsibility for higher education) have published plans (Boning and Roeloffs 1970), as have individual universities in Germany and other European countries. Great Britain has received some attention (Burgess 1972a), as has Canada (Duff and Berdahl 1966; Murray Ross 1972, pp. 242-258). As has been noted, these materials relate primarily to governance.

Related to governance as an issue is the question of university autonomy. This question has been considered quite important in many countries. Quite often, the struggle is a heated one between the academic community, which values autonomy in part for practical and in part for historical reasons, and governments and other public authorities, who feel that universities should be responsive to public wishes. The amount of autonomy universities enjoy differs substantially from country to country, and it is often difficult to make accurate predictions on the basis of political regimes or academic organization. For example, in India where higher education is under the jurisdiction of the states, some regions have allowed the universities substantial autonomy, while others interfere in academic affairs, often on quite small matters (Dongerkery 1967; Rudolph and Rudolph 1972). The University of Ghana during the time of the Nkrumah regime was able to maintain a good deal of independence despite substantial efforts to persuade it to follow government directives. Also, universities of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are very directly related to the political orientations and policies of their governments; yet, on matters of academic organization and some internal questions, universities in this part of the world have been remarkably resistant to change. Consequently, it is rather difficult to generalize about the degree of autonomy an academic institution may or may not have. Local circumstances, historical traditions, effective academic leadership, the nature of the ruling elite in the particular country, and many other factors confound effective prediction in this area.

American universities pride themselves on their autonomy. Some of the best American universities have a good deal of self-government and it is rare that outside political forces intervene directly in academic affairs, although it is by no means unknown for such interference to take place. The decentralization of decisionmaking in American education, the large number of private universities, and the granting of funds from the Federal Government for specifc projects

rather than for general expenses all contribute to autonomy. But American universities have moved quickly to meet demands from government, the public, or from private interests for various programs or policies.

American higher education expanded very quickly after World War II to meet public demand, universities moved quickly to conduct research required by the government, and new programs were added to the curriculum in areas such as foreign area studies and space science. Thus, American higher education has not differed much from the broader orientation toward society represented by government and the large private foundations and, perhaps as a result of this general consensus, the issue of undue public pressure on the universities has not arisen at the national level in the U. S.

A number of countries have tried to protect the autonomy of the universities through various policies. This is a particularly difficult problem in countries where almost all university funds come from the public purse. The British University Grants Committee is one of the best known agencies for protecting academic autonomy, and even it has come under some criticism in recent years (Bowden 1967, pp. 28-42; Boyle 1966, pp. 3-19). Nigeria, India, Australia and several other former British colonies have adopted similar agencies to protect autonomy. Other issues of academic autonomy in the British sphere have also been analyzed (Ashby 1964; Fletcher 1968; Hoch 1970; Ashby and Anderson 1966, pp. 317-364). German academic freedom and autonomy has traditionally been protected by the notion of *lehrfreiheit* or academic freedom. In Germany, the professor had the right to teach according to his own views and to teach the subject matter he thought appropriate within the area of his expertise. It is significant that this notion of academic freedom did not extend to political utterances or to general social policies (Ringer 1969). It is important to recall that politically the influential German model was a highly circumscribed one in terms of students. The limits of academic freedom have been substantially expanded in the U. S. Very few case studies of university autonomy exist (Dongerkery 1967; Puccetti 1972, pp. 223-241), yet such studies are quite useful in understanding the kind of pressures brought on institutions of higher education.

The question of how far a university's responsibilities to its funding agencies or to the society go is a difficult one, and no clear formula can be devised. It is certainly true that universities have a responsibility to serve those who pay for them and to provide a relevant education to their students. On the other hand, freedom to teach, to conduct

research, and to hold perhaps unpopular scientific or political opinions is at the center of scholarly inquiry, and where universities have been too tied to government directives, they have often not been fully productive academic institutions. Yet, when academic institutions have untrammeled autonomy and are able to ignore societal trends, they often become irrelevant. This was the experience of the English universities during the period prior to the Industrial Revolution.

Increasing pressures on universities to respond to societal demands are being felt everywhere. Further, as higher education is perceived as an important element in society because of its key training function and the ever larger clientele, and as the universities grow increasingly expensive, governments want to guarantee that "value" is obtained from the public funds spent on higher education. They also want to insure that the universities will not undermine social stability. Thus, management techniques such as management-by-objectives and other means of insuring fiscal control over academic expenditures are being pioneered in the U. S. and will undoubtedly be applied in other countries. In Britain, the UGC is taking an increasingly active role in monitoring expenditures of universities. In Japan, the Ministry of Education has taken an active role in pressing for university reforms to insure stability on campus (Kitamura and Cummings 1972, pp. 303-324). It seems certain that a combination of factors is acting to increase outside pressures on universities in the coming period. Demands for fiscal accountability for increasingly expensive institutions, recognition that the university is a key institution in modern societies and must therefore be controlled to some degree to maintain its productivity and stability, demands for curricular and research applicability to social and technological needs will combine to place ever greater pressure on the universities. At best university authorities will probably strike a compromise with those in control of power in society. Perhaps this is as it should be, since there are certainly legitimate social ends that higher education should serve. But to make sure that the autonomy necessary to maintain academic freedom and to provide freedom for creative research is maintained, academic leadership must understand how to use the increasing influence of the university and how to effectively use the governance process.

Research Studies on Comparative Higher Education

The literature on the sociology, politics, and economics of higher education in cross-national perspective is not extensive. However, basic research on broader theoretical questions relating to comparative

higher education is often the basis of studies that form the framework, for detailed analysis of particular issues. UNESCO and OECD have provided a valuable service by sponsoring studies on various aspects of higher education and collecting statistical information. These international organizations have provided a comparative data base that is available to researchers. Western Europe and North America have been covered particularly well, while major gaps still exist in the data on Third World countries (OECD 1969, 1970). OECD has also sponsored studies of national policies concerning education in a number of member countries (documents on the U. S., Netherlands, Japan, France, West Germany, and several other nations have been released so far). These reports generally contain substantial analysis of higher education, and are written by teams of international experts. Both analysis and statistical information are provided, and the documents give an excellent consideration of trends in educational policies in the countries in question. A unique feature of these documents is that a rebuttal by officials of the countries under analysis is also included. OECD reports on particular aspects of higher education in its member nations are also quite valuable. An example of such a report is a 1964 study of the economics of higher education (OECD 1964). UNESCO has sponsored studies of access to higher education in many nations (*Access* 1965) and a number of studies on educational reform and expansion. The International Association of Universities has also produced several research studies of a comparative nature. One particularly valuable effort is a report on higher education expansion (International Association of Universities 1960). Thus, international agencies are among the most active producers of comparative analysis and information. Their reports, with a few notable exceptions, tend to be bland and somewhat unimaginative due to the fact that international agencies must avoid antagonizing member nations. Further, they must also rely uncritically on statistics supplied by member governments, statistics that are not always either correct or up to date. Given these limitations, international organizations have been some of the most valuable sources of research on comparative higher education. Barbara Burn, in her Carnegie Commission sponsored volume, presents detailed data on higher education in nine countries (1971) and provides comprehensive reports on these nations.

Economic aspects of higher education have been considered in several studies (Bockstael and Feinstein 1970; Psacharopoulos 1972, pp. 141-158; Rogers 1971, pp. 20-27; Wilson and Lewis 1970, pp. 15-30; Williams, Blackstone, and Metcalf, forthcoming; and Blaug 1968, pp.

398-408). Many other studies deal with particular countries. Bockstael and Feinstein take a broader view of the economics of higher education, concentrating on the economic aspects of expansion and other trends; other commentators present more traditional economic studies of particular aspects of higher education, such as the return to investment in postsecondary education.

Studies in the comparative politics and sociology of higher education are particularly scarce. A volume edited by Lloyd and Susanne Rudolph (1972) deals with Indian higher education but has applications to the politics of education in developing countries. David Abernathy and Trevor Coombe have provided an overview of the politics of education in developing countries in their thoughtful article (1965, pp. 287-302). John Baldwin and Richard Goldthwaite edited a volume dealing with the politics of European universities in the early modern period, providing some useful historical comparisons to our knowledge (1972), while Munior Bashshur has dealt with higher education and political development in the Middle East (1966, pp. 451-461). Joseph Ben-David, in his various writings, has combined sociology and history in his consideration of the development of universities in the 20th century (1968-69, pp. 3-35). Ben-David's OECD study on universities and research also applies sociological insights to a policy question (1968).

It is clear that the literature of the social sciences as applied to comparative higher education is not large. Studies of individual universities, groups of professors or students, and other aspects of higher education have been done—with the U. S. having performed a considerable number of comprehensive analytical studies. It is hoped that the data base in this area will be enlarged by other countries in the near future, and that analysts concerned with policy will have the opportunity to review relevant studies of a more general and theoretical nature.

General and Policy Related Material

In this section the stress will be on some of the more important general materials that either try to integrate perspectives on aspects of higher education or which address themselves to specific, policy-related issues. This section then provides an overview of some of the more important currents in the literature of comparative higher education and focuses on key issues that are now being analyzed.

There are a number of books that deal with some of the broader issues facing universities. Christopher Driver's volume provides a

general analysis of key issues (reform, numbers, governance) but also weaves this general analysis into case studies of universities in several industrialized countries, including Britain, the U. S., France and Japan (1972a). Eric Ashby's writings also rank at the very top of the most influential and thoughtful analyses of higher education. His *Universities: British, Indian, African* is particularly important as an analysis of the transfer of institutions (1966). Ashby's recent essay on the structure of higher education is also quite useful (1973). Clark Kerr's volume, *The Uses of the University*, has become something of a classic of description of the situation of higher education in the post-war period (1966). While concerned specifically with the U. S., Kerr's insights have valuable comparative dimensions as well.

A number of edited volumes are valuable sources both of data on higher education in particular countries and of comparative discussion of common issues (Bereday and Lauwerys 1959; Holmes and Scanlon 1971; Kertesz 1971; Niblett 1970; Niblett and Butts 1972; Perkins 1972a). Most of these volumes are collections of papers combining national considerations of higher education issues and discussions of particular themes, such as the role of universities in national development, politics and higher education, autonomy, reform, and others. These books are particularly valuable because they present the experiences of different countries between two covers and provide the reader with some data to draw comparative conclusions.

Several studies deal with the worldwide phenomenon of expanding enrollments and the shift to mass higher education systems. George Bereday's *Universities for All* (1973) is the most comprehensive of these studies and provides an overview of most of the key issues in cross-national perspective. Leland Medsker (1972) describes the international trend toward expanded educational opportunities and articles by Cerych and Furth (1972, pp. 14-28) and Martin Trow (1972b, pp. 61-84; 1970, pp. 1-42) deal with some of the implications of mass higher education in a variety of countries. The ramifications of the expansion of higher education are immense, many of which have been felt in the U. S. and are only now becoming visible in other nations. Changes in the employment structure due to larger numbers of "credentialed" individuals, demands for curricular changes within the universities, a changing social class base for the student population, and increasingly impersonal higher education institutions are all part of the equation. In some countries wholly new structures of post-secondary education have been created to meet increased demand. The British Open University and a similar institution in Japan are

among the most dramatic examples of new institutional structures. German efforts to create a comprehensive university (Hamm-Bruecher 1972, pp. 325-336) along with the upgrading of technical high schools and colleges in West Germany, Britain, France, and other countries are all efforts to provide more university-level education to those demanding it.

Several writers have tried to place comparative higher education into a workable framework. While these efforts have not yet produced a workable model, they are nonetheless valuable (Cerych 1972b; Anderson 1965, pp. 3-19; Holmes 1972, pp. 17-25). These analyses stress the common elements among higher educational institutions in various societies and the similar roles they perform from nation to nation.

Higher Education Reform: Key Issue of the Seventies

University reform is among the most controversial and important issues facing the academic community. Not only do differences exist among the various constituencies of the academic community concerning the desirability and nature of reform, but the formulation of workable reform plans has been a challenge of major proportions. The U. S. has by no means been the only nation to grapple with the issue of educational reform. Other nations faced even more dramatic problems in their universities that stimulated reform efforts. The decentralization of American higher education spread reform efforts quite widely and obscured a national focus on this question. One of the few exceptions to this general rule is the recent Carnegie Commission report on university reform (1972). While it is clear that the U. S. has its own special problems and its own academic context, there is much to learn from the experiences and programs of other countries.

Typically, academic reform comes only as the result of careful and usually time consuming deliberations by official committees, either in or outside the university. Achieving a workable consensus on any reform proposal is often a difficult task and sometimes proves impossible. Many measures are shelved due to lack of support from one or another of the major actors—the faculty, funding sources, political officials, administrators, and sometimes students. Or reform measures may be subtly sabotaged from the inside by elements of the university community who are opposed to them but unable to engineer their total defeat. There is no question but that universities are among the most conservative of institutions and have been slow to change their curricula, organization, or structure. As noted earlier, professors tend to be rather conservative on university issues and not especially inclined to change. But universities in the post-war period have undergone rapid change, often without plan. Changes simply take place by accretion, adding programs or students and making no alteration in the nature or function of the institution.

In few countries has change in higher education happened because academics simply felt reform was appropriate. In most cases, crises of one kind or another were evident and only then did the academic

community seriously consider changes. The following list is a partial enumeration of events that have stimulated reform in recent years:

Expansion of enrollments. Practically every university system has expanded its enrollments in the post-war period, with the U. S. taking the lead in this area. Demands from increasingly vocal segments of the population, particularly the middle classes, and the needs of technological societies for trained manpower have made expansion difficult to resist, even among academics who have been reluctant to change the traditional roles of universities. Most European university systems are moving rapidly toward the American "mass" system, while the U. S. pushes toward "universal" higher education. The developing countries are not far behind.

University-society relations. One of the most common points of tension in academia is the relationship between university and government or other public agencies. As higher education has become increasingly expensive, with most funding coming from public sources, governments and other public agencies have taken a stronger interest in higher education. The centrality of higher education to the economy and political life has increased this trend. Traditional concepts of academic autonomy are called into question on intellectual as well as on financial and management grounds. Public confidence has been eroded in some countries by the various crises involving students and others in the past few years.

Student activism and unrest. While by no means unprecedented, student activism reached dramatic proportions during the 60s. For the most part, student activism was aimed at broad political questions rather than at the university, but in many countries the two issues were commingled. Furthermore, the universities were seen by some activists as representatives of the system and were attacked for this reason. In some cases, discontent with curriculum, *in loco parentis,* or other campus-based questions triggered student dissent. University authorities for the most part were not very effective in dealing with student activism.

The traditional curriculum. Demands from students for "relevance" (variously defined) and from industry, government and others for training in keeping with technological development have placed great pressures on the traditional academic curriculum, particularly in the liberal arts.

The technology of instruction. Increasing numbers and changes in the curriculum have made the traditional means of academic instruction in many cases ineffective or uneconomical. Replacement of the

lecture system has proved difficult to achieve, however, and student discontent has occasionally been focused on large classes and "impersonality."

The financial crisis. As higher education has expanded and become more complex, it has also become more expensive. Some economists have noted that the cost of higher education has increased faster than practically anything else in industrialized societies. In most countries, public funds are the major source of university financing, and there is some reluctance to provide needed monies. Thus, universities must justify their growing demands for funds and at the same time improve management and budgeting techniques—a particularly difficult task for institutions run along rather traditional lines.

University governance. With expansion of enrollments, larger academic budgets, increasingly complex research institutes, and other changes, great pressure has been placed on traditional forms of academic governance. In Europe particularly, where university administration tended to be decentralized, the problem has been particularly acute. The trend toward a more powerful central executive authority in the university on the American pattern has been evident along with a general expansion of the role and power of administrators. Another theme has been toward increasing presentation of various elements of the university community in formal governance, thereby taking power from the established senior faculty. In a number of countries, including France and West Germany, students have been involved in the governance process.

The changing role of universities. This topic is related in many ways to many of the previously mentioned challenges. As universities become more important to their societies and are asked to take on more functions, they naturally have to expand their roles from training a small elite to serving diverse needs of complex societies. Inevitably, such expansion in role involves pressure for change within the institution.

The "politicization" of the university. As higher education has become more expensive and more important to society in terms of training elites, innovative technologies, and research, those in authority and others concerned with social change have naturally paid more attention to the university than in the past. The academic community itself, perhaps feeling its new importance, has in some countries taken a more directly political role, at times bringing the university into some jeopardy as a result.

Universities have tried to meet these and other challenges in differ-

ent ways. The very definition of reform is a potentially difficult problem. What is radical reform in one country may be tokenism in another. To government officials, reform is often rationalizing governance so that increased fiscal accountability will be possible. To junior faculty, reform means increasing their power in the institution. To radical students, reform means increased relevance in the curriculum and often direct power over the academic process. Thus, when examining specific countries it is necessary to carefully define terms. For our purposes, reforms include almost any planned change in an aspect of the university, except perhaps for the most minor alterations.

The scope and number of recent reform efforts are substantial and it is difficult to generalize about them. Both Japan and the U. S. have dra.ted large numbers of documents relating to reform in individual institutions and these vary substantially (Kitamura and Cummings 1962, pp. 303-324). Governments in many nations have been instrumental in stimulating reforms and have had a role in formulating plans (Patterson 1972, pp. 281-302; Altbach 1972a, pp. 251-267). In some instances, semi-official agencies have been responsible for stimulating reform, as was the case in Canada (Duff and Berdahl 1966). In a very few cases students have been instrumental in the reform process. One example of an important student initiative was in West Germany during the early period of the reform movement there (Nitsch 1965).

Inevitably, the process of reform moves more slowly than anticipated and in most cases success is not complete. Resistance on various levels, problems with funding, institutional inertia, and other factors all contribute to delays. One of the problems is that it is seldom possible to implement one single change in a university. Usually reforms are related to other aspects of academic life and to achieve particular results a chain of events must occur. Changes in the curriculum may well mean changes in staffing patterns, in textbooks and library holdings, and in the stability of entire academic departments. For example, the elimination of some foreign language requirements in American colleges and universities has meant a redistribution of academic subjects many students take and has caused serious problems for departments that teach foreign languages. The shift in emphasis from foreign area studies to domestically-oriented subjects in the U. S. by the government and private foundations caused serious reverberations in some American universities. The raising of technical institutes to university status in Great Britain and West Germany made adjustment in the existing universities necessary (Boning and Roeloffs 1970).

It has been pointed out that there is a great deal of overlap in aca-

demic models and that few universities can claim a pure lineage. The German university of the late 19th century not only had a powerful effect on American higher education but provided the model for universities in central and eastern Europe as well. In recent years, there has been a great deal of conscious borrowing of academic models and practices. As noted, emerging nations have borrowed elements from many industrialized nations in recent years, and this within the framework of their basic academic systems, which were based on European colonial models. This borrowing must be carefully considered by students of comparative higher education systems and decisionmakers in the countries involved. For example, the French and West German use of some aspects of American academic organization in many of their new universities may prove at least partly counterproductive in the long run. Many of the practices being adopted in Europe are simultaneously being called into question in the U. S.

What is the process of university reform? Both the ends and means of reform differ substantially among countries, but there are a few generalizations concerning the factors that stimulate reform and concerning some of the means of implementing such reform (Council for Cultural Cooperation 1967; Cerych 1972a, pp. 105-119). It has often been said that the university is inherently one of society's most conservative institutions, and that regardless of how avant garde or progressive the faculty is on public questions, they are usually conservative on questions of academic change. The innate conservatism of established organizations and institutions, the feeling by many academics that they are recognized experts in their fields and therefore know how to run their institutions best, and the strongly felt traditions of academic life dating from the Middle Ages hinder reform and enhance *status quo* tendencies in the academic community.

It is probably a truism that change is difficult for any organization with established patterns of operation. This is especially true for academic organizations. The traditional status of the senior faculty has been a notable stumbling block, since this group enjoys much power and substantial control over both the institution as a whole and their own work situation in particular. Many reform measures are seen as limiting either the status or the perquisites of the senior faculty or as dangerous for the overall traditions of the institution. In reality, there is little doubt that many reforms do indeed aim at opening academic governance to a wider range of people and at making universities more accountable to outside authorities in terms of finances and programs. They are, therefore, implicit threats to those who hold power.

Another critical element of the reform process is funds. It seems that almost all reform measures proposed are costly and there is increasing opposition to the expenditure of large amounts of money for higher education. It is often through problems of funding that government and other nonuniversity agencies get involved in academic policymaking or implementation. And it is often the case that imaginative plans for academic change or improvement are limited by funding problems. Increasingly, funds for all academic matters come directly from government agencies or through administrative bodies such as the University Grants Committee in Great Britain (Driver 1972b, pp. 325-339). Even in the U. S., where private and foundation funding has been an important source of income for higher education, the trend toward government financing is marked.

Politics, of course, plays a key role in all aspects of university life, and perhaps particularly with regard to reform. This is not surprising, since the university is a complex and important institution with many interests competing for power and position. Internal political groups, meaning faculty on various levels, administrators, and sometimes students, are naturally involved in decisions concerning the nature and implementation of reform, or for that matter most other university questions. Outside political forces are often involved in the academic political equation as well (Altbach 1972a, pp. 251-267). Government agencies are inevitably involved because of financial considerations, and policy questions often enter into university planning and reform as well. The well-known conflict between the University of California and the Governor of the State of California during the late 1960s is an example of how political considerations, sometimes of a partisan nature, can have major implications for the financial and policy aspects of the university. In a country like India, perhaps an extreme although not unprecedented example, partisan politics is an everyday fact of life for most universities, and the process of change (or even of day-to-day operation) becomes a matter of balancing the various political forces that impinge on the campus. The university's administrative head not only becomes a crisis manager, to use Clark Kerr's term, but a full-time political operative as well. These comments are not meant to suggest political considerations are an alien element in university affairs. On the contrary, they are neither unprecedented nor improper when large sums of public money are at stake. Yet, it is imperative to strike a balance between the legitimate interests of funding agencies, students, and perhaps the general public, and the ideas and orderly planning of the university community itself.

The results of over-politicization of the university has had damaging effects in general, and has made reform either impossible or distorted.

Academic reform seems often to be stimulated by two very different elements. One can be characterized by Kitamura and Cummings' apt phrase, the "big bang"—that is, massive outside intervention or stimulation of the university based on some perceived external crisis (1972, pp. 303-324; Patterson 1972, pp. 281-302); the other is local initiative by a particular university or an element of the university. The most dramatic reforms have been produced by the "big bang" approach, although as both Kitamura and Cummings and Patterson point out, the initiative of the government may be dissipated or distorted when implemented by the universities.

Governments seek to change patterns of higher education in various ways, and an enumeration of some of these ways may shed light on the process of reform. The most dramatic means of effecting reform is by direct intervention into university affairs through changes in the statutes governing higher education. This is the French way. After the 1968 riots, the government simply reorganized the structure of the University of Paris and bureaucratically introduced changes in many elements of the highly centralized French university system (Patterson 1972, pp. 281-302; "University Reform in France" 1969, pp. 706-727). Faculties, administrators, and students had little choice but to accept these structural changes, although in many cases elements of the academic community were able to emasculate the intent of the government reforms.

Governments also use less dramatic means for stimulating reform. Financial incentives and penalties are common tools. The Indian government through the University Grants Commission has provided funds for special programs deemed useful and has withheld funds, for example, from new colleges in an effort to limit expansion (Education Commission 1964-1966). These efforts have had only limited success, since coercion was not used and other sources of funds were found to continue expansion. Many governments on national and state levels have provided funds for important higher education programs. For example, the expansion of foreign area studies in the U. S. was stimulated largely by government and foundation funds offered to the universities. Without the availability of such funding, these programs would have been impossible. A common tool used to stimulate reform is the creation of entirely new institutions that reflect the new ideas or programs which those in authority feel are needed. In West Germany and in Great Britain many new institutions have been

created that reflect new models of higher education, innovations in the curriculum, or subjects in demand that were not offered in large supply at the established institutions. In some cases, these new institutions have provided models for traditional or other new schools, but often the innovative institutions simply coexist with their more traditional counterparts (Boning and Roeloffs 1970; Perkins 1970; Grignon and Passeron 1970). The Indian government's effort to upgrade technological education by establishing several excellent Institutes of Technology, with strong financial support from the Central Government and assistance from several foreign countries, has created excellent institutions but has not had much effect on the overall standards of higher education. And in the U. S. any number of new and innovative institutions coexist with the established universities without basically affecting them.

Governments have at times taken drastic action to obtain desired changes in higher education. One of the most dramatic of such actions was the closing of China's universities during the cultural revolution and the massive structural changes that were subsequently made. Replacement of many professors and the reeducation of others was part of a campaign to mold the universities into a more acceptable form. Student unrest in a number of countries has stimulated authorities to close institutions and changes are often made to limit activism before reopening them. The structural changes made by the Soviet Government over the years have dramatically altered the nature of Soviet higher education and have created new and quite important types of structures, such as research institutes (Rosen 1963). The durability of the traditions of universities, and perhaps part of the reason that they are so difficult to change, can be indicated, however, in the fact that even nations that diligently have tried to institute change through radically different in structure and function from those in the mainstream Western European-North American tradition (Trahan 1973, in press; Institute for Social Research 1970).

Universities as institutions have proven exceptionally durable and in many ways conservative (Clark 1969, pp. 1-25). Without question, the university is a unique social institution that in most societies is allowed almost unprecedented freedom to express minority viewpoints and to pursue research and teaching. In part the traditions of academic freedom and autonomy and perhaps even the authority of the senior faculty have contributed to this unique position. Thus, reforms should not destroy this uniqueness in their efforts to achieve in-

creased relevance or to insure that higher education contributes the maximum to the tasks of national economic development.

A balance somehow must be achieved between the innate conservatism of universities and of their senior faculty members and the need to change to meet unprecedented challenges. And the leadership for such a balance and consensus must come from the faculty. Students seldom take a long-term interest in what seem to be mundane academic issues. In addition, the most vocal students tend to be substantially more radical than the majority of the student population. Furthermore, government officials and even university administrators cannot have the same contact with the day-to-day realities of the university as does the faculty. However, recent studies of faculty in a number of countries hold out little hope that farsighted leadership and a willingness to pursue considered change will be forthcoming.

Directions for Future Research

As is clear from this discussion, the vast majority of research done to date is not truly comparative but rather concerns individual countries or regions. This research is useful and some nations need much additional research to simply understand higher education within those countries. The most glaring lacuna in the field is comparative research and analysis. The following listing is intended to provide suggestions for future research either comparative or national.

Additional statistical data. For many countries, accurate and up-to-date statistical information concerning higher education is unavailable or only partially available. This is particularly true for developing countries. Accurate information concerning enrollments, numbers of institutions, and teachers in higher education is needed. Additional data on drop-out rates, social mobility among students, and other information would make the planning process easier and probably more effective.

University governance. In recent years, organizational theory has been applied to higher education so that there is now a basis for examining in detail the ways in which universities are governed. The roles of administrative officers, faculty, and other elements of the academic community are quite important in understanding how the institutions as a whole function. Studies on governance are lacking for most individual countries, and are glaringly absent in a comparative context.

University management. Studies of efficient and effective means of administering institutions of higher education are needed. With increased demands for financial accountability and fiscal responsibility, it is urgent that the most effective means of managing universities be found. The use, for example, of PPBS and other budgeting and administrative systems places a great premium on conducting relevant research in this area. The financial aspects of university management are also crucial in any consideration of this kind. Such research should, of course, take into account the unique features of the university as an institution, perhaps particularly the fact that productivity is often difficult to measure, and the fact that the large majority of university administrators has little background in management.

The university and society. The roles of government, politicians, and interest groups in the affairs of universities are crucial. The im-

pact of the university community and of intellectuals in general on society is also important. The politics of higher education and the ways in which universities and policy interact should also receive additional analytic attention. Such research has direct implications for particular nations and would also be valuable in understanding in a comparative context how universities function in different societal settings.

The academic man. Few studies of the professors have been undertaken. Questions of the social recruitment of professors, their status, problems and aspirations are all crucial to understanding the academic institution. The opinions of faculty members on politics, university issues, and other matters are also quite critical. Since faculty are the backbone of decisionmaking and of the ethos of most universities, such studies are particularly important.

University reform. There is still a great need for relevant studies of this aspect of higher education. Studies of the process of reform and the factors that promote and inhibit it are greatly needed. Research on reform cannot only assist directly in this area, but can provide increased understanding of general issues of university governance and politics.

Student problems and activism. Of all the areas related to comparative higher education, this one has probably received the most attention from researchers, particularly in those industrialized countries greatly affected by student activism. Further research, however, is needed and more comparative cross-cultural studies are particularly important. Attitude surveys, studies of the conditions of activism, and of the physical and academic problems facing students are all important.

The university and the educational system. The interrelationship between the university and other elements of the educational system is in need of systematic study. The incorporation, for example, of technological education into the university and the raising of technical colleges to university status is an important international development. The impact of the university on secondary and primary education, and vice versa, is also important. Both national studies and comparative analysis are needed in these areas.

Conclusions

This essay has illustrated some key areas of comparative higher education research and analysis and indicated how some of this research can be relevant or at least peripherally useful to a consideration of higher education in the U. S. Despite a lead in research and some experience with the process of academic change, the U. S. does not have all the answers and the academic planning process in this country has been notably insular in its orientation. It is hoped that the available research and analysis concerning university problems in other countries will be utilized by American analysts and planners and that further research on comparative higher education will be stimulated.

It is clear that models provided from abroad are not going to solve many of the challenges facing the American university—just as American practices can seldom be applied directly to countries with different social, political, economic, and educational realities. Yet, perspectives from other countries can at least suggest ways of approaching problems that might lead to solutions. For example, a careful study of Britain's Open University can have implications for American efforts in adult and continuing education. Academic planners from Japan studied the Open University and are now in the process of applying some of its practices in Japan. India is also thinking along these lines. An examination of university systems in which students have some role in academic power, such as in many Latin American nations or in some German and French universities, may provide some useful ways of looking at the possible involvement of students in academic governance in the U. S.

While universities do have strong common historical and intellectual roots, they are also uniquely national institutions that reflect their national settings. It is even true that academic institutions in many nations reflect local or regional influences as well—there are differences in academic styles and practices in the American south and in other parts of the country, as there are in different parts of India. Thus, while there may be few direct applications of policy from one nation to another, a cross-national perspective can help to highlight alternatives or problems within national systems.

Comparative higher education has a place as a subfield of many academic disciplines and as a tool for those concerned with the direct problems of universities. Universities are complex institutions that

deserve attention by sociologists, political scientists, and others concerned with societal subsystems. Because of their common roots, cross-national studies of universities can provide some useful perspectives in understanding a single institutional arrangement in different national settings. The university is one of the few institutions that can be studied in this way. Students and faculty share common roles and status from society to society. Thus, the comparative study of student activism or of student attitudes can yield some useful information. The university, therefore, is not only an important social institution beset with its share of problems, which may be solved more easily by recourse to comparative analysis, but is also a significant and somewhat unique institution that might yield some significant theories about how complex institutions work in a variety of societal settings.

Bibliography

This bibliography is not a complete listing of materials on comparative higher education. The focus is on cross-cultural materials of relevance to Americans concerned with problems and issues in higher education. References and analysis relating to cross-national research that are readily available in libraries have been included here. Some materials dealing with single countries have also been included. Here, books and articles deemed useful to gain an understanding of issues important to American readers have been included. For additional materials on developing countries, see Philip G. Altbach (1970a).

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current research literature on higher education for publication in the National Institute for Education's monthly volume, *Research in Education* (RIE). Readers who wish to order ERIC documents cited in the bibliography should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Drawer 0, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. When ordering, please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Unless otherwise noted, documents are available in both microfiche (MF) and hard/photocopy (HC). All microfiche titles cost $0.65; hard/photocopy reproduction costs $3.29 per 100 pages. All orders must be in writing and payment must accompany orders of less than $10.00.

Materials of particular importance in the bibliography are marked by an asterisk (*). Entries that have been ordered for inclusion in the ERIC files are indicated by a double dagger (‡).

*Abernathy, David, and Coombe, Trevor. "Education and Politics in Developing Countries." *Harvard Educational Review* 35 (Summer 1965): 287-302.

*"Academic Freedom at University College, Rhodesia." *Minerva* 5 (Autumn 1966): 123-147.

Access to Higher Education. 2 vols. Paris: UNESCO, 1965.

Access to Higher Education in Europe: Comparative Background. Paris: UNESCO, 1969. ED 029 569. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

Adams, Don. *Higher Educational Reforms in the Republic of Korea*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1965. ED 054 023. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

Adams, Walter. "Higher Education in the British Colonies." *Universities Quarterly* 1 (February 1947) : 145-153.

‡Adiseshiah, Malcolm. "The Role of the University." In *Let My Country Awake*. Paris: UNESCO, 1970. Pp. 265-293.

"African Approaches to the Development of Higher Education." In *Post-Primary Education and Political and Economic Development*, edited by D. Piper and T. Cole. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1964. Pp. 153-177.

African-American Institute. *African Colleges and Universities: A Digest of Information*. New York: African-American Institute, 1970.

Aguirre Beltran, Gonzalo. *La Universidad Latinoamericana*. Jalapa, Mexico: Universidad Veracruzana, 1961.

*Albornoz, O. "Academic Freedom and Higher Education in Latin America." *Comparative Education Review* 10 (June 1966) : 250-256.

———. *Libertad Academica y Educacion Superior en America Latina*. Caracas, Venezuela: Dipuven, 1966.

———. *Acerca de la Universidad y otros asuntos*. Caracas, Venezuela: Publicaciones del Instituto Societas, 1970.

*Aitbach, Philip G. "Students and Politics." In *Student Politics*, edited by S. M. Lipset. New York: Basic Books, 1967. Pp. 74-94.

———. *Turmoil and Transition: Higher Education and Student Politics in India*. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

———. *Higher Education in Developing Countries: A Select Bibliography*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1970a. ED 042 415. MF-$0.65; HC-$7.58.

———. *A Select Bibliography on Students, Politics, and Higher Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, 1970b. ED 041 555. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

———. "Student Movement in Historical Perspective: The Asian Case." *Youth and Society* 1 (March 1970c) : 333-357.

———. "Education and Neocolonialism." *Teachers College Record* 72 (May 1971) : 543-558.

———. "Problems of University Reform in India." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972a) : 251-267.

———. *The University in Transition: An India Case Study*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1972b.

*———. ed. *Comparative University Reform*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1973.

——— and Kelly, David. *American Students: A Select Bibliography on Student Activism and Related Topics.* Lexington, Mass.: Heath-Lexington, 1973.

Alvarez de Morales, A. *La "Ilustracion" y la reforma de la universidad en la Espana de siglo XVIII.* Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Administrativos, 1971.

*Anderson, C. Arnold. "Emerging Common Problems in the World of Universities." *International Review of Education* 11 (1965) : 3-19.

*———. "University Planning in an Underdeveloped Country: A Commentary on the University of East Africa Plan, 1967-70." *Minerva* 7 (Autumn-Winter 1968-69) : 36-51.

"The Anniversary of the Cordoba Declaration and its Ramifications in the Argentine." *Minerva* 7 (Autumn-Winter 1968-69) : 95-112.

Antoine, Gerald, and Passeron, Jean Claude. *La Reforme de l'Universite.* Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1966.

*Archer, Margaret Scotford, ed. *Students, University and Society.* London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972.

Armytage, W. H. G. "Foreign Influences in English Universities: Four Case Histories." *Comparative Education Review* 7 (February 1964) : 246-261.

Arnold, Matthew. *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany.* New York: Macmillan, 1892.

Arnove, Robert F. "A Survey of Literature and Research on Latin American Universities." *Latin American Research Review* 3 (Fall 1967) : 45-62.

Aron, Raymond. "Quelques problemes des universites francaise." *European Journal of Sociology* 3 (1962) : 102-122.

———. "Some Aspects of the Crisis in the French Universities." *Minerva* 2 (Spring 1964) : 279-285.

Ashby, Eric. "Self-Government in Modern Universities." *Science and Freedom* (December 1956) : 3-10.

———. *Technology and the Academics.* London: Macmillan, 1958.

———. *Patterns of Universities in Non-European Societies.* London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1961.

———. "Universities Under Siege." *Minerva* 1 (Autumn 1962a) : 18-29.

———. " 'Wind of Change' in African Higher Education." *Africa Report* 7 (March 1962b) : 5-6, 23.

———. *Community of Universities.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

*———. *African Universities and Western Tradition.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964a.

———. "The Diversity of Universities in the Commonwealth." *Australian University* 2 (May 1964b) : 1-16.

*———. "A Contribution to the Dialogue on African Universities." *Universities Quarterly* 20 (December 1965a) : 70-89.

*———. "Some Problems of Universities in New Countries of the British Commonwealth." *Comparative Education* 2 (November 1965b) : 1-10.

*———. *Universities: British, Indian, African.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

*———. "The Future of the Nineteenth Century of a University." *Minerva* 6 (Autumn 1967) : 3-17.

———. "Government, the University Grants Committee and the Universities: Hands Off the Universities." *Minerva* 6 (Winter 1968) : 244-256.

*———. "The Academic Profession." *Minerva* 8 (January 1970) : 90-99.

———. *Any Person, Any Study: An Essay on Higher Education in the United States.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

———. "The Great Reappraisal." In *Universities Facing the Future,* edited by W. R. Niblett and R. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 29-44.

‡———. *The Structure of Higher Education: A World View.* Occasional Paper No. 6. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1973.

——— and Anderson, Mary. "Autonomy and Academic Freedom in Britain and in English-Speaking Countries of Tropical Africa." *Minerva* 4 (Spring 1966) : 317-364.

———. *The Rise of the Student Estate in Britain.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning. *Goals for Southeast Asian Universities.* Bangkok: ASAIHL, 1968.

Atcon, Rudolph. *Principios de la reforma universitaria.* 2 vols. Honduras: Universidad Autonoma de Honduras, 1960.

———. *The Latin American University: A Key for an Integrated Approach to the Coordinated Social Economic and Educational Development of Latin America.* Bogota: ECO Revista de la Cultura de Occidente, 1966a.

———. *La Universidad Latinoamericana.* Bogota: Libreria Bucholz, 1966b.

Bakke, E. Wight, and Bakke, Mary S. *Campus Challenge: Student Activism in Perspective.* Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1971.

Bakole, M. M. "The African University, Today and Tomorrow." *Presence Africain* (January 1965) : 147-158.

Baldridge, J. V., ed. *Academic Governance.* Berkeley, California: McCutcheon, 1971.

Baldwin, John W., and Goldthwaite, Richard A., eds. *Universities in Politics: Case Studies from The Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.

Bashshur, Munir. "Higher Education and Political Development in Syria and Lebanon." *Comparative Education Review* 10 (October 1966) : 451-461.

Basic Guidelines for the Reform of Education. Tokyo: Prime Minister's Secretariat, 1972.

Bastid, Marianne. "Economic Necessity and Political Ideals in Educational Reform During the Cultural Revolution." *China Quarterly* (April-June 1970) : 16-45.

Beard, Ruth M. *et al. Objectives in Higher Education.* London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1968.

Bela, Ramon. "Spanish Educational Reform—Three Views." In *The Task of Universities in A Changing World,* edited by S. Kertesz. South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1971. Pp. 353-369.

Beloff, Michael. *The Plateglass Universities.* London: Secker and Warburg, 1968.

Ben-David, Joseph. "Scientific Productivity and Academic Organization in Nineteenth Century Medicine." *American Sociological Review* 25 (December 1960) : 828-843.

———. "The Scientific Role: The Conditions of Its Establishment in Europe." *Minerva* 4 (Autumn 1965) : 15-54.

*———. *Fundamental Research and the Universities: Some Comments on International Differences.* Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1968.

*———. "Universities and the Growth of Science in Germany and the United States." *Minerva* 7 (Autumn-Winter 1968-69) : 3-35.

———. *American Higher Education: Directions Old and New.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

———. "The Profession of Science and Its Powers." *Minerva* 10 (July 1972b) : 362-383.

———. "Science and the University System." *International Review of Education* 18 (1972c) : 44-60.

*——— and Zloczower, Awraham. "Universites and Academic Systems in Modern Societies." *European Journal of Sociology* 3 (1962) : 45-84.

Benjamin, Harold R. W. *Higher Education in the American Republics.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Bentwich, Norman. "The Hebrew University Returns to Scopus." *Universities Quarterly* 24 (Summer 1970) : 258-265.

Benveniste, Guy. *The Politics of Expertise.* Berkeley, Calif.: Glendessary Press, 1972.

*Berdahl, Robert O. *British Universities and the State.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1959.

——— and Altomare, George. *Comparative Higher Education: Sources of Information.* Occasional Paper No. 4. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972.

Bereday, George Z. F. "Higher Education in Comparative Perspective." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 404 (November 1972) : 21-30.

*———. *Universities For All: International Perspectives on Mass Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

*——— and Lauwerys, Joseph, eds. *The Yearbook of Education 1959: Higher Education.* London: Evans, 1959.

Bertram Vivian, B. B. "The Place of Universities in Modern Society." *Comparative Education* 1 (March 1965) : 45-62.

Betsky, S. "Universities in An Industrial Culture." *Universities Quarterly* 24 (Winter 1969) : 7-28.

Bibliographische Materialen Zur Hochschulforschung. 2 vols. West Berlin: Institut fur Bildungforschung in der Max Planck Gesellschaft, 1967.

Bigelow, Karl. "Higher Education in Tropical Africa." In *Pan Africanism Reconsidered,* edited by John David. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1962. Pp. 203-218.

*Biobaku, Saburi. "African Studies in an African University." *Minerva* 1 (Spring 1963) : 285-301.

Blaug, Mark. "The Productivity of Universities." *Minerva* 6 (Spring 1968) : 398-408.

Blewett, John, ed. *Higher Education in Postwar Japan.* Tokyo: Sophia University, 1965.

Blume, Stewart. " 'Brain Drain'—A Look at the Literature." *Universities Quarterly* 22 (June 1963) : 281-290.

Boalt, G., and Herman, L. *Universities and Research: Observations on the United States and Sweden.* Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell, 1970.

*Bockstael, Eric, and Feinstein, Otto. *Higher Education in the European Community: Reform and Economics.* Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington, 1970.

‡*Boning, E., and Roeloffs, K. *Innovation in Higher Education: Three German Universities: Aachen, Bochum, Konstanz.* Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1970.

Bonneau, Louis-Phillippe, and Corry, J. A. *Quest for the Optimum: Research Policy in the Universities of Canada.* Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1973.

Bourricaud, Francois. *Universities a la derive.* Paris: Stock, 1971.

Bowden, Lord. "The Place of Universities in Modern Society." *Comparative Education* 2 (March 1965) : 45-63.

———. "The Universities, the Government and the Public Accounts Committee." *Minerva* 6 (Autumn 1967) : 28-42.

———. "English Universities—Problems and Prospects." In *The Task of Universities in a Changing World,* edited by S. Kertesz. South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1971. Pp. 235-258.

Bowles, Frank. *Access to Higher Education.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Boyle, Edward. "Parliament and University Policy." *Minerva* 5 (Autumn 1966) : 3-19.

——— *et al.* "Report on James." *University Quarterly* 26 (Spring 1972) : 127-163.

Bradley, E., ed. *The University Outside Europe: Essays in the Development of University Institutions in Fourteen Countries.* London: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Bratchelle, D. F., and Heald, M., eds. *The Aims and Organization of Liberal Studies.* Oxford, England: Pergamon, 1966.

Brickman, William W. "Historical Background of International Cooperation among Universities." *School and Society* 94 (April 16-30, 1966) : 227-234.

Bronfenbrenner, Martin. *Academic Encounter: The American University in Japan and Korea.* New York: Free Press, 1964.

Bronowski, Jacob, *et al. Imagination and the University.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Brook, G. L. *The Modern University.* London: Andre Deutsch, 1965.

Brown, Irene. "The Case for Basic Research in a Developing Country." In *Tanzania: Revolution by Education,* edited by J. Resnick. Arusha: Longmans, 1967. Pp. 200-210.

Burgress, Tyrrell, ed. *Planning for Higher Education.* London: Cornmarket Press, 1972a.

———. *The Shape of Higher Education.* London: Cornmarket Press, 1972b.

Burn, Barbara B. "Comparisons for Four Foreign Universities." In *The University As An Organization,* edited by James Perkins. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973a. Pp. 79-106.

———. *The Emerging System of Higher Education in Italy: Report of a Seminar.* New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1973b.

*———; Altbach, Philip G.; Kerr, Clark; and Perkins, James. *Higher Education in Nine Countries.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

*Busch, Alexander. "The Vicissitudes of the Privatdozent: Breakdown and Adaptation in the Recruitment of the German University Teacher." *Minerva* 1 (Spring 1963) : 319-341.

Buschbeck, M. "Politization of the University." *Western European Education* 3 (Winter 1971-72) : 329-348.

Butler, Lord. *Survival Depends on Higher Education.* Delhi: Vikas, 1971.

Caine, Sydney. "Universities and the State." *Political Quarterly* 37 (July-September 1966) : 237-254.

———. *British Universities: Purpose and Prospects.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Campos, C. "Mobility of University Staff in Europe." *Universities Quarterly* 25 (Winter 1970) : 28-48.

Capelle, Jean. *Tomorrow's Education: The French Experience.* Oxford, England: Pergamon, 1967.

‡Cardozo, Manuel, ed. *Higher Education in Latin America.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1961.

Carmichael, Oliver C. *Universities: Commonwealth and American: A Comparative Study.* New York: Harper, 1959.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Reform on Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972. ED 066 137. MF-$0.65; HC-$7.58.

———. *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Carnoy, Martin. *The Genius of Our Race: Education as Imperialism and Colonialism.* New York: David McKay, forthcoming.

*Carr-Saunders, A. M. *New Universities Overseas.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1961.

*———. "Staffing African Universities." *Minerva* 1 (Spring 1963): 302-318.

———. "Britain and Universities in Africa: Result of the Report of the Asquith Commission." *Universities Quarterly* 19 (June 1965): 227-239.

Carter, Charles. "The Efficiency of Universities." *Higher Education* 1 (February 1972): 77-92.

‡Case, Harry, and Bunnell, Robert. *The University of the Philippines: External Assistance and Development*. East Lansing, Michigan: College of Education, Michigan State University, 1970.

Cerych, Ladislav. "Academic Reforms of Higher Education in Europe: Overview of Major Trends and Innovations." In *Reform on Campus*, edited by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972a. Pp. 105-119.

‡———. *A Global Approach to Higher Education*. Occasional Paper No. 3. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972b.

——— and Furth, D. E. "The Search for a Global System: Unity and Disparity of Post-Secondary Education." In *Higher Education in a Changing World*, edited by B. Holmes and D. Scanlon. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 108-119.

——— and ———. "On the Threshold of Mass Higher Education." In *Universities Facing the Future*, edited by W. R. Niblett and R. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1972, Pp. 14-28.

Chagula, W. K. "The East African Academy: Academic Freedom in the Economic, Social, and Political Context of East Africa." *Minerva* 6 (Spring 1968): 408-418.

Chambers, M. M. *Universites of the World Outside the USA*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950.

Clapp, Margaret, ed. *The Modern University*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1950.

Clark, M. L. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Clark, Terry N. "Institutionalization of Innovations in Higher Education: Four Models." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 13 (June 1968): 1-25.

Clerk, J. P., and Debbasch, C. "Student Participation in University Governance." *Western European Education* 3 (Winter 1971-1972): 349-354.

Codignola, Trislano. "The University Reform." *Western European Education* 3 (Winter 1971-1972): 316-328.

Commission on Higher Education in East Africa. *Higher Education in East Africa: Report of the Commission, 1937.* London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1937.

Commission on Relations Between Universities and Government. *The University, Society and Government.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1968.

Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia. *Tertiary Education in Australia.* Melbourne, 1965.

Committee on Higher Education (Robbins Committee). *Higher Education: Report of the Committee.* London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1963.

———. *Higher Education: Report of the Committee, Appendix 5: Higher Education in Other Countries.* London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1963.

Committee on the International Migration of Talent. *The International Migration of High Level Manpower.* New York: Praeger, 1970.

———. *Modernization and the Migration of Talent.* New York: Education and World Affairs, 1970.

"The Comprehensive Principle at Work." In *Universities Facing the Future,* edited by W. R. Niblett and R. F. Butt. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 311-396.

Cook, J. W. "University Traditions in the British Commonwealth." *Science and Freedom* 9 (August 1957) : 12-17.

Coombs, Philip, and Hallak, Jacques. *Managing Educational Costs.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Council for Cultural Cooperation: Council of Europe. *Structure of University Staff.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1966.

*———. *Reform and Expansion of Higher Education in Europe.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1967.

Cowen, Robert. "The Utilitarian University." In *Higher Education in a Changing World,* edited by B. Holmes and D. Scanlon. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 90-107.

Crawford, Malcolm. "On Academic Freedom in Africa." *Minerva* 5 (Spring 1967) : 376-381.

Crouch, Colin, and Mennell, Stephen. *The Universities: Pressures and Prospects.* London: Fabian Society, 1972.

Cummings, William. "The Problems and Prospects for Reform in Japanese Higher Education." *Tsuda Daigaku Kiyoo* 2 (March 1971) : 12-74.

*Curle, A. "Nationalism and Higher Education in Ghana." *Universities Quarterly* 16 (June 1962) : 229-242.

———. *Educational Strategy for Developing Societies.* London: Tavistock Publications, 1963.

Curti, Merle, and Carstenson, Vernon. *The University of Wisconsin: A History, 1848-1925.* Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. "Starre und Offenheit der deutschen Universitat: die Chancen der Reform." *European Journal of Sociology* 3 (1962) : 263-293.

Daiches, David, ed. *The Idea of a New University: An Experiment in Sussex.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1964.

Das Gupta, A. K. "Reflections on Higher Education in India in the Light of the Robbins Report." *Minerva* 2 (Winter 1964) : 160-168.

Davis, R. G. "Prototypes and Stereotypes in Latin American Universities." *Comparative Education Review* 9 (October 1965) : 275-281.

Debbasch, Charles. *L'universite desorientee: atopsie d'une mutation.* Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1971.

Dedijer, Stevan. "Underdeveloped Science in Underdeveloped Countries." *Minerva* 2 (Autumn 1963) : 61-81.

———. *Brain-Drain and Brain-Gain.* Lund: Research Policy Program, 1966.

Dejean, Christian, and Biennemans, Charles-Louis. *L'Université Belge: Du Pari au défi.* Brussels: Institut de Sociologie, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1971.

de Kiewiet, C. W. *The Emergent African University: An Interpretation.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971. ED 065 027. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

Development of Higher Education in Africa. Paris: UNESCO, 1963.

Dillon, Wilton S. "Universities and Nation-Building in Africa." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 1 (1963) : Pp. 75-88.

Dion, Leon, *et al. L'enseignement superieur: bilans et prospective.* Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montreal, 1971.

"Diversifying Post-Secondary Education in Europe." *Paedagogica Europaea* 7 (1972) : 7-147.

Dolan, E. F. *Higher Education in Africa South of the Sahara: Selected Bibliography, 1945-1961.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, 1961.

Dongerkery, S. R. *University Autonomy in India.* Bombay: Lalvani, 1967.

Dowsey, Stewart, ed. *Zengakuren: Japan's Revolutionary Students.* Berkeley, California: Ishii Press, 1970.

*Driver, Christopher. *The Exploding University*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972a.

*———. "Higher Education in Britain: The Cow Ruminant." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972b) : 325-339.

Ducret, Bernard, and Rafe-uz-Zaman, eds. *The University Today: Its Role and Place in Society; an International Study*. Geneva: World University Service, 1960.

Duff, James. "The Ecology of Higher Education." *Minerva* 5 (Autumn 1966) : 39-46.

*Duff, James, and Berdahl, Robert. *University Government in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Economic Council of Canada. *Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies*. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972.

*Education Commission, 1964-1966. *Education and National Development: Report of the Education Commission, 1964-1966*. New Delhi: Government of India, Ministry of Education, 1966.

Ehrenreich, John, and Ehrenreich, Barbara. *Long March, Short Spring*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969.

*Einaudi, Luigi. "University Autonomy and Academic Freedom in Latin America." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 28 (Summer 1963) : 636-646.

Eisemon, Thomas. *The Impact of American Educational Assistance: The Case of Indian Engineering Faculty*. Bombay: Tata Institute of Social Sciences, forthcoming.

Emmerson, Donald, ed. *Students and Politics in Developing Nations*. New York: Praeger, 1968.

Eto, Jun. "The University: Myths and Possibilities." *Journal of Social and Political Ideas in Japan* 5 (December 1967) : 179-194.

Fafunwa, A. Babs, and Hanson, John. "The Post Independence Nigerian Universities." In *Comparative University Reform*, edited by P. G. Altbach. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, forthcoming.

"Faire l'universite." *Esprit* 32 (May-June 1964) : 705-1214.

Falk, Barbara, and Dow, Kwong Lee. *The Assessment of University Teaching*. London: Society for Research Into Higher Education, 1971.

Faure, Edgar. *Philosophie d'une Réforme*. Paris: Plon, 1969.

Feasibility of an International University. New York: United Nations, 1970. ED 056 668. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

Federation of University Students of Equador. "First Seminar on the University Reform." *Democratic Education* (1969) : 41-50.

Fehl, Noah E. *The Idea of a University in East and West.* Hong Kong: Chung Chi College, 1962.

Ferguson, John. "The Open University in Britain." In *Universities Facing the Future,* edited by W. R. Biblett and R. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 373-385.

Feuer, Lewis. *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements.* New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Filipovic, Marijan. *Higher Education in Yugoslavia.* Belgrade: Federal Commission for Education and Culture, 1971.

The Financing of Higher Education in Africa. Paris: UNESCO, 1962.

*Fischer, Joseph. *Universities in Southeast Asia.* Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1964.

Fletcher, Basil. *The Freedom and Autonomy of Universities.* London: SCM Press, 1968.

———. *Universities in the Modern World.* Oxford: Pergamon, 1968.

*Flexner, Abraham. *Universities: American, English, German.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Foster, J. F., and Craig, T. eds. *Commonwealth University Yearbook, 1968.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Fraser, W. R. *Reforms and Restraints in Modern French Education.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Friedeburg, Ludwig, *et al. Freie Universitat und politisches Potential der Studenten.* Berlin: Luchterhand, 1968.

*Froese, Leonhard. "University Reform: A Comparative Analysis of the American, Russian, and German Universities." In *Higher Education in a Changing World,* edited by B. Holmes and D. Scanlon. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 135-146.

"A Further Digging In of Heels in Spain." *Minerva* 6 (Summer 1968) : 772-787.

Gardner, John W. *AID and the Universities.* New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.

Gaudino, Robert L. *The Indian University.* Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1965.

‡Gelfand, M. A. *University Libraries for Developing Countries.* Paris: UNESCO, 1968.

Gilbert, Irene. "The Indian Academic Profession: The Origins of a Tradition of Subordination." *Minerva* 10 (July 1972) : 384-411.

Gillett, Margaret. "Western Academic Role Concepts in [the] Ethiopian University." *Comparative Education Review* 7 (October 1963) : 149-162.

Godfrey, E. M. "The Economics of an African University." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 4 (December 1966) : 435-455.

Goldschmidt, Dietrich. "West Germany." In *Students, University, and Society*, edited by M. S. Archer. London: Heinemann, 1972. Pp. 154-172.

Gondodiwirjo, Widarso. *Higher Education in Indonesia: Current Status and Proposals for Change*. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1971.

*Gouldner, Alvin. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles, 1 and 2." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2 (December 1957; March 1958) : 281-303; 444-467.

Green, V. H. H. *The Universities*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1969.

Griffith, Alison, ed. *The Role of American Higher Education in Relation to Developing Countries*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961.

*Grignon, C., and Passeron, J. C. *Innovation in Higher Education: French Experience Before 1968*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1970.

Gvishiani, D. M.; Mikulinsky, S. R.; and Yaroshevsky, M. G. "The Sociological and Psychological Study of Scientific Activity." *Minerva* 11 (January 1973) : 121-129.

Hacquaert, Armand. *The Recruitment and Training of University Teachers*. Ghent: International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, 1967.

Hahn, Walter. "Higher Education in West Germany: Reform Movements and Trends." *Comparative Education Review* 7 (June 1963) : 51-60.

———. "Patterns and Trends in West German Universities: Academic Self Government vs. State Control." *Journal of Higher Education* 36 (May 1965) : 245-253.

———. "Departure from Tradition in West German Universities." *Educational Record* 53 (Summer 1972) : 250-255.

Halls, W. D. *International Equivalences in Access to Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO, 1971.

Halmos, Paul, ed. *Sociological Studies in British University Education*. Sociological Review Monograph Series No. 7. Keele, England: University of Keele, 1963.

Halsey, A. H. "British Universities and Intellectual Life." *Universities Quarterly* 12 (February 1958) : 141-152.

——— and Marks, Stephen. "British Student Politics." In *Students*

in Revolt, edited by S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970. Pp. 35-59.

*——— and Trow, M. *The British Academics*. London: Faber and Faber, 1971.

Hamm-Bruecher, Hildegard. "Towards the Comprehensive University in Germany." In *Universities Facing the Future*, edited by W. R. Niblett and R. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 325-336.

Hannah, Harold W. *Resource Book for Rural Universities in the Developing Countries*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1966.

Hannah, H. W. and Caughey, Robert R. *The Legal Base for Universities in Developing Countries*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Hanson, John W. *Education, Nsukka: A Study in Institution Building Among the Modern Ibo*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1968.

*Harbison, Frederick. "Problems of Higher Education in the Newly Developing Countries." *Educational Record* 46 (Spring 1965): 132-142.

———. "The African University and Human Resource Development." *Journal of African Studies* 3 (May 1965): 53-62.

Harris, R. S., ed. *Changing Patterns of Higher Education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Harris, R. S., and Tremblay, A. B. *A Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960.

Harris, Seymour, ed. *Economic Aspects of Higher Education*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1964. ED 059 657. MF-$0.65; HC-$9.87.

*Harrison, John P. "Confrontation with the Political University." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 334 (March 1961): 74-83.

———. "The Latin American University—Present Problems Viewed Through the Recent Past." In *The Task of Universities in a Changing World*, edited by S. Kertesz. South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1971. Pp. 414-432.

Haskins, Charles H. *The Rise of Universities*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Havighurst, Robert. "Latin American and North American Higher Education." *Comparative Education Review* 4 (February 1961): 174-182.

‡*Hayden, Howard, ed. *Higher Education and Development in Southeast Asia.* 4 vols. Paris: UNESCO, 1967.

Heald, David. "Reform and Tradition in German Universities Today." *Universities Quarterly* 21 (September 1967) : 453-462.

———. "The Transformation of the German Universities." *Universities Quarterly* 23 (Autumn 1969) : 408-419.

Hecquet, I. "Demographic Changes as a Factor Influencing the Development of Higher Education." In *Higher Education in a Changing World,* edited by B. Holmes and D. Scanlon. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 149-160.

Heirich, Max. *The Spiral of Conflict: Berkeley, 1964.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Helms, E. *Die Hochschulreform in den USA und ihre Bedeutung fur die BRD.* Hannover: Hermann Schroedel Verlag, 1971.

Henderson, Algo D. "Asian Universities in Transition." *Educational Record* 38 (October 1957) : 360-367.

Hetherington, Hector J. W. *The Social Function of the University.* London: Lindsey Press, 1953.

"The Higher Education Act, Ceylon." *Minerva* 5 (Autumn 1966) : 102-111.

"Higher Education in the Asian Region." *Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia* 7 (September 1972) : 5-137.

Higher Education in East Africa. Entebbe: Government Printer, 1958.

*"Higher Education in Industrial Societies." In *The Embattled University,* edited by S. Graubard and G. Ballotti. New York: Braziller, 1970. Pp. 369-435.

Hoch, Paul. *Academic Freedom in Action.* London: Sheed and Ward, 1970.

Hodgkin, Thomas. "The Idea of an African University." *Universities Quarterly* 12 (August 1958) : 376-384.

———. "African Universities and the State: Another View." *Comparative Education* 3 (March 1967) : 107-114.

Hodgetts, J. E., ed. *Higher Education in a Changing Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Holmes, B. "The Development of Higher Education: A Comparative Study." *Paedagogica Europaea* 7 (1972) : 17-25.

*Holmes, Brian, and Scanlon, David G., eds. *Higher Education in a Changing World: World Yearbook of Education, 1971-1972.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971.

Hoong, Yip Yat, ed. *Role of Universities in National Development Planning in Southeast Asia.* Singapore: Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, 1971.

Howe, C. Walter. "African Approaches to the Development of Higher Education: A Sampling of Views of African Academics." In *Post-Primary Education and Political and Economic Development*, edited by D. Piper and T. Cole. London: Cambridge University Press, 1964. Pp. 153-177.

*Hsu, Immanuel. "The Reorganization of Higher Education in Communist China, 1949-1961." *China Quarterly* No. 19 (July-September 1964) : 128-160.

Hu, C. T. "The Chinese University: Target of the Cultural Revolution." *Saturday Review* (August 19, 1967) : 184-186, 200-202.

———. "The Chinese People's University: Bastion of Marxism-Leninism." In *Universities Facing the Future*, edited by W. R. Niblett and R. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 63-74.

Humphreys, H. "Some Notes on Latin-American Universities." *Universities Quarterly* 9 (November 1954) : 58-65.

Hunter, Guy. *Education for a Developing Region: A Study in East Africa*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1963.

———. *High Level Manpower for Development*. Paris: UNESCO-International Association of Universities, 1967.

Hurtubise, Rene, and Rowat, Donald. *The University, Society, and Government*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1970.

Hyslop, J. M. "The University of East Africa." *Minerva* 2 (Spring 1964) : 286-302.

"Indian University Reform." *Minerva* 5 (Autumn 1966) : 47-81.

"Indian University Reform—II." *Minerva* 5 (Winter 1967) : 242-264.

"Indian University Reform—III." *Minerva* 5 (Spring 1967) : 391-412.

*Institute for Social Research, University of Zagreb. *Innovation in Higher Education: Reforms in Yugoslavia*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1970.

"The Internationalization of the University." *Student World* 60 (1967) : 105-185.

‡International Association of Universities. *The Expansion of Higher Education*. Paris: International Universities Bureau, 1960.

———. *Methods of Establishing Equivalences Between Degrees and Diplomas*. Paris: UNESCO, 1970.

International Association of University Professors and Lecturers. *The Recruitment and Training of University Teachers*. Ghent: IAUPL, 1967.

‡International Bureau of Education. *Access of Women to Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO, 1952.

International Conference of Universities 1950. Paris: International Universities Board, 1951.

The Interplay of Scientific and Cultural Values in Higher Education Today. Paris: International Association of Universities, 1960.

Jacoby, Susan. "Toward an Educated Elite: The Soviet Universities." *Change* 3 (November 1971) : 33-39.

James, E. Cyril. "A Note on the Nature and Functions of the University." In *Higher Education and Development in Southeast Asia*, edited by Harold Hayden. Paris: UNESCO and International Association of Universities, 1967. Pp. 490-508.

Jaspers, Karl. *The Idea of the University*. Boston: Beacon, 1959.

Jennings, W. Ivor. "Universities in Colonies." *Political Quarterly* 17 (1946) : 228-244.

Jones, H. A., *et al. The University and the New World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

Joussellin, Jean. "A New University for a New World." *Student World* 59 (1966) : 3-85.

Kajubi, W. Senteza. "New Directions in Teacher Education in East Africa." *International Review of Education* 17 (1971-1972) : 197-209.

Kan, David K. *The Impact of the Cultural Revolution on Chinese Higher Education*. Los Angeles: University of California, 1971.

Kerr, Anthony J. *University of Europe*. Westminster, Maryland: Canterbury Press, 1962.

*Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.

*Kertesz, Stephen D., ed. *The Task of Universities in a Changing World*. South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1971.

Keyes, H. M. R., ed. *International Handbook of Universities*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Kietlinska, Zofia. "The Pedagogy of Higher Education: Research Problems." *Higher Education* 1 (May 1972) : 185-190.

Kilson, Martin. "Trends in Higher Education." In *Africa and the United States: Images and Realities*, edited by H. Kitchen. Boston: U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, 1961. Pp. 61-80.

King, Edmund. "Universities in Evolution." *International Review of Education* 8 (1963) : 399-415.

*King, Richard G. *The Provincial Universities of Mexico: An Analysis of Growth and Development*. New York: Praeger, 1971.

*Kitamura, K. and Cummings, W. K. "The 'Big Bang' Theory and Japanese University Reform." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972) : 303-324.

*Kloss, G. "University Reform in West Germany: The Burden of Tradition." *Minerva* 6 (Spring 1968) : 323-353.

*———. "The Growth of Federal Power in the West German University System." *Minerva* 9 (October 1971) : 510-527.

*Koehl, Robert. "The Uses of the University: Past and Present in Nigerian Educational Culture, Parts 1 and 2." *Comparative Education Review* 15 (June and October 1971) : 116-132, 367-377.

Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai. *Higher Education and the Student Problem in Japan.* Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai, 1972.

Kotschnig, Walter M., ed. *The University in a Changing World: A Symposium.* London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

———. *Unemployment in the Learned Professions: An International Study of Occupational and Educational Planning.* London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Kratochvil, Antonin. *Die kommunistische Hochschulpolitik in der Tscheckoslowakei.* Munich: Fedes, 1968.

Kroef, Justus M. van der. "The Educated Unemployed in Southeast Asia: A Common Problem in India, Indonesia and the Philippines." *Journal of Higher Education* 31 (April 1960) : 177-184.

———. "Asia's Brain Drain." *Journal of Higher Education* 39 (May 1968) : 241-253.

*Krueger, M., and Wallisch-Prinz, B. "University Reform in West Germany." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972) : 340-351.

Kwapong, Alexander. "Address by the Vice Chancellor." *Minerva* 4 (Summer 1966) : 542-554.

———. "University of Ghana; Address by the Vice-Chancellor Dr. Alexander Dwapong to Congregation." *Minerva* 6 (Autumn 1967) : 87-98.

Lanning, John Tate. *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Lawlor, John, ed. *The New University.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

*———. *Higher Education: Patterns of Change in the 1970s.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Layard, Richard; and King, John; and Moser, Claus. *The Impact of Robbins: Expansion in Higher Education.* London: Penguin, 1969.

The Learning Society: Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. Toronto: Ministry of Government Services, 1972.

Leefmans, Bert. "French Educational Reform and the American Student." *Liberal Education* 53 (May 1967) : 203-215.

Lewis, L. J. "Higher Education in the Overseas Territories." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 8 (November 1959) : 3-21.

*Lipset, S. M., ed. *Student Politics*. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

*——— and Altbach, P. G., eds. *Students in Revolt*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

——— and Ladd, Jr., E. C. *The American Professoriate*. New York: McGraw-Hill, forthcoming.

Liwicha, Jadwiga. *Polish Universities*. Warsaw: Polognia Publishing House, 1959.

Lockwood, Geoffrey. "Planning a University." *Higher Education* 1 (November 1972) : 409-434.

Lockwood, J. "The Transplantation of the University: The Case of Africa." In *A Decade of the Commonwealth: 1955-1964*, edited by W. Hamilton, *et al.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1966. Pp. 259-273.

Lowenthal, M. "'Unsanctioned Projects' for French University Reform." *Universities Quarterly* 22 (September 1968) : 371-384.

Lubot, Eugene. "Peking University Fifty-five Years Ago: Perspectives on Higher Education in China Today." *Comparative Education Review* 17 (February 1973) : 44-57.

L'université européenne. Bruxelles, Belgium: Institut de Sociologie de L'Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1973.

MacKenzie, Norman; Eraut, Michael; and Jones, Hywel C. *Teaching and Learning: An Introduction to New Methods and Resources in Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO, n.d. ED 046 231. Not available from EDRS.

Maclure, Stuart. "England's Open University: Revolution at Milton Keynes." *Change* 3 (March-April 1971) : 62-68.

Macmillan, David S. *Australian Universities*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1968.

March, John. "Developments in the French Higher Schools." *Democratic Education* (1972) : 11-19.

*Martin, David, ed. *Anarchy and Culture: The Problem of the Contemporary University*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

"Mass Higher Education." *Higher Education* 2 (May 1973) : 135-274.

Matejko, A. "Planning and Tradition in Polish Higher Education." *Minerva* 7 (Summer 1969) : 621-648.

Mazo, Gabriel Del. *Estudiantes y gobierno Universitaris, bases doctrinares y tecnica.* Buenos Aires: El Ateneo, 1946.

*———. *La Reforma universitaria y la universidad latinoamericana.* Buenos Aires: Compania Editora y Distribuidora del Plata, 1957.

———. *El movimiente de la reforma universitaria en America Latina.* Lima: Universidad Nacional, 1966.

Mazuri, Ali A., and Tandon, Yash. "The University of East Africa As A Political Institution." *Minerva* 5 (Spring 1967) : 381-386.

*McConnell, T. R. *The University and the State: A Comparative Study.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967 (reprint series). ED 011 342. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

——— and Berdahl, Robert O. "Planned Mechanisms for British Transition To Mass Higher Education." *Higher Education Review* 3 (Autumn 1971) : 3-22.

———; ———; Fay, Margaret. *From Elite to Mass to Universal Higher Education: The British and American Transformation.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1973.

McCully, Bruce. *English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

McLin, Jon. "An Academic Common Market?" *American University Field Staff Reports* (West Europe Series) 5 (1970) : 1-6.

‡Medsker, Leland L. *The Global Quest for Educational Opportunity.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1972.

Merritt, Richard. "The Student Protest Movement in West Berlin." *Comparative Politics* 1 (July 1969) : 516-532.

Miller, G. W. *Higher Education Research in Australia ánd New Zealand.* London: Society for Research into Higher Education, 1970.

Montague, H. Patrick. "The Historic Function of the University." In *Higher Education in a Changing World,* edited by B. Holmes and D. Scanlon. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 15-26.

Mountford, James. *British Universities.* London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Morris, Charles, *et al.* "Second Thoughts on Robbins." *Universities Quarterly* 18 (March 1964) : 119-168.

Mumford, W. Bryant. "Some 'Growing Points' in African Higher Education." In *Yearbook of Education, 1936,* edited by H. Usill and E. Percy. London: Evans, 1936. Pp. 749-769.

Myers, Robert G. *Education and Emigration: Study Abroad and the Migration of Human Resources*. New York: McKay, 1972.

Myint, Hla. "The Universities of Southeast Asia and Economic Development." *Pacific Affairs* 35 (Summer 1962) : 116-127.

Nagai, Michio. "The University and the Intellectual." *Japan Quarterly* 12 (January-March 1965) : 46-52.

*———. *Higher Education in Japan: Its Take-Off and Crash*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1971.

———. *Some Dilemmas of Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, forthcoming.

Narkiewicz, Olga. "Polish or Socialist? *Universities Quarterly* 19 (September 1965) : 345-360.

Nash, Arnold Samuel. *The University and the Modern World*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.

"National Policies." In *Higher Education in a Changing World*, edited by B. Holmes and D. Scanlon. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 238-283.

"Nationalism in Canadian Social Science." *Minerva* 11 (January 1973) : 113-120.

"New Designs in Teacher Training." *Western European Education* 2 (Summer-Fall 1970) : 99-255 (special issue).

Newburn, H. K. "Recent Changes in the Organization and Administration of British Universities." *Monographs in Higher Education of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Arizona State University* 1 (1972) : 1-30.

Newman, John Henry. *The Idea of a University*. Reprint. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

*Niblett, W. Roy, ed. *Higher Education: Demand and Response*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

———. "The Survival of Higher Education." *Change* 4 (May 1972) : 44-49.

*——— and Butts, R. Freeman, eds. *Universities Facing the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Nichol, Davidson. "Politics, Nationalism, and Universities in Africa." *African Affairs* 62 (January 1963) : 20-28.

Nigeria, Commission of Post-Secondary School Certification and Higher Education. *Investment in Education: Report*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Education, 1960.

Nigeria, Federal Ministry of Education. *University Development in Nigeria: Report of National Universities Commission, 1963*. Apapa: Nigerian National Press, 1963.

Nitsch, Wolfgang, *et al. Hochschule in der Demokratie.* Berlin: Luchterhand, 1965.

*Noss, Richard. *Higher Education and Development in Southeast Asia: Language Policy.* Paris: UNESCO, 1967.

Nyerere, Julius K. "The University In a Developing Society." *Présence Africaine* No. 61 (1967) : 3-10.

Ofosu-Appiah, L. H. "The Idea of an African University." *Présence Africaine* No. 8 (January 1961) : 22-29.

Ojiaku, Mazi Okoro. "Two University Traditions in Africa: Contrast in Profile." In *Participants and Patterns in Higher Education: Research and Reflections,* edited by Ann Heiss, *et al.* Berkeley, Calif.: Program in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, 1973. Pp. 55-70.

Olumbummo, A., and Ferguson, John. *The Emergent University, with Special Reference to Nigeria.* London: Longmans, 1960.

*Onushkin, Victor G., ed. *Planning the Development of Universities: 1.* Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning, 1971. ED 067 058. MF-$0.65; HC-Not available from EDRS.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Economic Aspects of Higher Education.* Paris: OECD, 1964. ED 059 657. MF-$0.65; HC-$16.45.

———. *The Development of Higher Education: Quantitive Trends.* Paris: OECD, 1969.

*———. *Development of Higher Education, 1950-1967: Statistical Survey.* Paris: OECD, 1970.

*———. *Development of Higher Education, 1950-1967: Analytical Report.* Paris: OECD, 1971. ED 060 776. MF-$0.65; HC-$9.87.

———. *Quantitative Trends in Teaching Staff in Higher Education.* Paris: OECD, 1971a.

———. *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Japan.* Paris: OECD, 1971b.

———. *Towards New Structures of Post-Secondary Education: A Preliminary Statement of Issues.* Paris: OECD, 1971c. ED 052 698. MF-$0.65; HC-$3.59.

Orleans, Leo A. "Medical Education and Manpower in Communist China." *Comparative Education Review* 13 (February 1969) : 20-42.

Ortega y Gasset, Jose. *The Mission of the University.* New York: Norton, 1944.

Page, Colin F., and Greenaway, Harriet, eds. *Innovation in Higher Education.* London: Society for Research Into Higher Education, 1972. ED 063 879. MF-$0.65; HC-$6.58.

Passin, Herbert. *Society and Education in Japan*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, 1965.

*Patterson, Michelle. "French University Reform: Renaissance or Restoration." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972): 281-302.

*Pelczar, Richard. "University Reform in Latin America: The Case of Colombia." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972): 230-250.

Perkins, Harold. *Key Profession: A History of The Association of University Teachers*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969a.

*———. *Innovations in Higher Education: New Universities in the United Kingdom*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1969b.

———. "University Planning in Britain in the 1960s." *Higher Education* 1 (February 1972): 111-120.

*Perkins, James, ed. *Higher Education: From Autonomy to Systems*. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972a.

———. "Organization and Functions of the University." *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (December 1972b): 679-691.

———, ed. *The University as an Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Pettit, Philip. *The Gentle Revolution: Crises in Universities*. Dublin: Scepter Books, 1969.

Philippart, Andre. "The University in Belgian Politics Since the Confrontation of 1968." *Government and Opposition* 7 (Autumn 1972): 450-463.

Pinner, Frank. "Students—A Marginal Elite in Politics." In *The New Pilgrims*, edited by P. G. Altbach and R. S. Laufer. New York: McKay, 1972. Pp. 281-296.

*Polanyi, Michael. "The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economic Theory." *Minerva* 1 (Autumn 1962): 54-71.

Porter, John "The Democratization of the Canadian Universities and the Need for a National System." *Minerva* 8 (July 1970): 325-356.

Potter, G. R. "The German Universities Today." *Universities Quarterly* 13 (February 1959): 145-156.

Pratt, R. C. "University and State in Independent Tropical Africa." *Universities Quarterly* 21 (December 1966): 91-100.

Problems of Integrated Higher Education: An International Case Study of the Gesamthöchschule. Paris: International Association of Universities, 1972.

*Psacharopoulos, George. "The Economic Returns to Higher Education in Twenty-five Countries." *Higher Education* 1 (May 1972): 141-158.

———. *Returns to Education: An International Comparison.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Puccetti, Roland. "Authoritarian Government and Academic Subservience: The University of Singapore." *Minerva* 10 (April 1972): 223-241.

*Qubain, Fahim I. *Education and Science in the Arab World.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1966.

Rabinowitz, Dorothy. "Israeli Universities in a Time of Siege." *Change* 4 (February 1972): 42-47.

Rashdall, Hastings. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1936.

"Relentless Revolutionaries, Reluctant Reformers in West Germany." *Minerva* 6 (Summer 1968): 690-739.

"Report of the Ceylon Universities Commission." *Minerva* 2 (Summer 1964): 492-518.

"Report on the Development of a University in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia)." *Minerva* 3 (Winter 1965): 245-261.

"Report of the Survey Team on Education in Malawi." *Minerva* 3 (Winter 1965): 233-244.

‡*Reform and Development of Higher Education in Europe: France, the Netherlands, and Poland.* Paris: UNESCO, 1964.

Register of Research Into Higher Education, 1972, Mainly in the United Kingdom. London: Society for Research Into Higher Education, 1972.

Report of the Committee on Australian Universities. Canberra, 1957.

Report of the Commission on Higher Education in West Africa. London: HMSO, 1945.

Report of the Commission on University Education (Ghana), December 1960-January, 1961. Accra: Ministry of Information, 1961.

Report of the Conference on the Development of Higher Education in Africa. Paris: UNESCO, 1963.

Rice, A. K. *The Modern University: A Model Organization.* London: Tavistock, 1970.

Richards, Audrey I. "The Adaption of Universities to the African Situation: Review Article." *Minerva* 3 (Spring 1965): 336-342.

Riesman, David. "University Commentary: Notes on New Universities, British and American." *Universities Quarterly* 20 (March 1966): 128-146.

Rimmington, Gerald. "The Development of Universities in Africa." *Comparative Education* 1 (March 1965) : 105-112.

Ringer, Fritz. *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Robbins, Lord. "Of Academic Freedom." *Universities Quarterly* 20 (September 1966) : 420-435.

———. *The University in the Modern World*. London: Macmillan, 1966.

Robinson, Eric. "A Comprehensive Reform of Higher Education." *Western European Education* 3 (Winter 1971-1972).

Rodrigues Zorrilla, A., and Sosa, A. L. "The Principle of Autonomy and the Coordination of Education." *Democratic Education* (1970) : 15-23.

Rogers, Daniel. "Financing Higher Education in Less Developed Countries." *Comparative Education Review* 15 (February 1971) : 20-27.

Role of Universities in National Development Planning in South East Asia. Singapore: Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, 1971.

‡Rosen, Seymour. *Higher Education in the USSR: Curriculums, Schools and Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

‡——— and Apanasewicz, Nellie. *Higher Education in Poland*. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1963.

Ross, Aileen. "The Silent Sufferers: The Lecturer's Role in Student Unrest in India." In *Institutions and the Person*, edited by H. S. Becker, *et al*. Chicago: Aldine, 1968. Pp. 89-100.

Ross, Alec. "New Structures for Post-Secondary Education." *Higher Education* 1 (August 1972) : 363-366.

Ross, Murray G., ed. *New Universities in the Modern World*. New York: St. Martins, 1966.

———. "The Dilution of Academic Power in Canada: The University of Toronto Act." *Minerva* 10 (April 1972): 242-258.

Rosselli, John. "Studying Higher Education in Britain and America." *Universities Quarterly* 17 (March 1963) : 126-148.

Rothblatt, Sheldon. *The Revolution of the Dons: Cambridge and Society in Victorian England*. London: Faber, 1968.

*Rudolph, Lloyd, and Rudolph, Susanne, eds. *Education and Politics in India: Studies in Organization, Society, Policy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Russo, Giovanni. *Universita anno zero.* Rome: Armando, 1966.

Sanderson, Michael. *The Universities and British Industry 1850-1970.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Schachner, Nathan. *The Medieval Universities.* New York: A. S. Barnes, 1962.

*Schelsky, Helmut. "The Wider Setting of Disorder in the German Universities." *Minerva* 10 (October 1972) : 614-626.

Scherz-Garcia, Luis. "Some Dysfunctional Aspects of International Assistance and the Role of the University in Social Change." *International Social Science Journal* 19 (1967) : 387-403.

Schnapp, Alain, and Vidal-Naquet, Pierre, eds. *The French Student Uprising: An Analytical Documentary.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Schoenbaum, David. "The Free University of Berlin: How Free Can a University Be?" *AAUP Bulletin* 59 (March 1973) : 5-9.

Schwartz, Richard, ed. *Universitat und moderne Welt.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1962.

Sensini, Alberto. *La riforma universitaria.* Torino: Centra di ricera e documentazione "Luigi Einaudi," 1966.

Servan-Schreiber, Jean-Jacques. *The American Challenge.* New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Seybolt, Peter. "China's Revolution in Education: The Struggle Between Two Lines." *Canadian and International Education* 1 (June 1972) : 29-41.

*Shah, A. B., ed. *Education, Scientific Policy and Developing Societies.* Bombay: Manaktalas, 1967.

Shaplin, J. T. "The Realities of Ashby's Vision." *Universities Quarterly* 15 (June 1961) : 229-237.

———. "A Sea of Faces: Teacher Training for Nigeria and the Ashby Report." In *Education and Training in the Developing Countries,* edited by W. Y. Elliott. New York: Praeger, 1966. Pp. 115-132.

Shils, Edward. "The Study of Universities: The Need for Disciplined Enquiry." *Universities Quarterly* 16 (December 1961a) : 14-18.

*———. "Scientific Development in the New States." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 17 (February 1961b) : 48-52.

*———. "The Formation of the West African Intellectual Community: Tasks and Possibilities." In *Africa: The Dynamics of Power,* edited by H. Passin and J. A. B. Jones-Quartey. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press, 1963. Pp. 179-208.

*———. "Modernization and Higher Education." In *Modernization,* edited by M. Weiner. New York: Basic Books, 1966. Pp. 81-97.

———. *Criteria for Scientific Development, Public Policy and National Goals.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1968a.

———. "The Implantation of Universities: Reflections on a Theme of Ashby." *Universities Quarterly* 22 (March 1968b): 142-166.

———. "The Academic Profession in India." *Minerva* 7 (Spring 1969) : 345-372.

———. "Stanford and Berlin: The Spheres of Politics and Intellect." *Minerva* 10 (July 1972) : 351-361.

———. "Change and Reform." In *Comparative University Reform,* edited by P. G. Altbach. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, forthcoming.

Shimbori, Michiya. "Comparison Between Pre- and Post-War Student Movements in Japan." *Sociology of Education* 37 (Fall 1963) : 59-70.

———. "Comparative Study of Career Patterns of College Professors." *International Review of Education* 10 (1964) : 284-296.

———. "Sociology of a Student Movement—A Japanese Case Study." *Daedalus* 97 (Winter 1968) : 204-228.

———. "The Academic Marketplace in Japan." *The Developing Economies* 7 (December 1969): 617-639.

Shiozuki, Kentaro. "Asian Universities in Transition." *Democratic Education* (1968) : 19-25.

Shryock, Richard H., ed. *The Status of University Teachers.* Ghent: International Association of University Professors, 1961.

Silberman-de Villiers, Leo. "Comparative Academics." *Confluence* 6 (Summer 1957) : 112-127.

Silcock, T. H. "Academic Standards and the New Universities of South-East Asia." *Science and Freedom* 19 (June 1961): 7-14.

*———. "The Development of Universities in South-East Asia to 1960." *Minerva* 2 (Winter 1964) : 169-196.

*———. *Southeast Asian University: A Comparative Account of Some Developing Problems.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1964.

Simon, B. "Higher Education in Poland." *Universities Quarterly* 7 (February 1953) : 176-183.

Singh, Amrik, and Altbach, P. G., eds. *The Higher Learning in India.* Delhi: Vikas, 1973.

Sloman, Albert E. *A University in the Making.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Spaulding, Seth, and Herman, Joseph. "Speculations from an International Perspective." In *Universities Facing the Future*, edited by W. R. Niblett and R. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 45-60.

Spender, Stephen. *The Year of the Young Rebels*. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

‡Springer, Hugh, and Craig, T., eds. *Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, 1971*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Sontheimer, Kurt. "Student Opposition in Western Germany." *Government and Opposition* 3 (Winter 1968) : 49-87.

Springer, George. "Universities in Flux." *Comparative Education Review* 12 (February 1968) : 28-38.

Stabler, John. "The University of Zambia." *Journal of Higher Education* 39 (January 1968) : 32-38.

The Staffing of Higher Education. Paris: International Association of Universities, 1960.

Steger, Hanns-Albert. *Die Universitaten in der gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung Lateinamerikas*. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann Verlag, 1967.

Stone, Richard. "A Model of the Educational System." *Minerva* 3 (Winter 1965) : 172-186.

Stretch, K. L. "Academic Ecology: On the Location of Institutions of Higher Education." *Minerva* 2 (Spring 1964) : 320-335.

Study on Teachers: Quantitative Trends in Teaching Staff in Higher Education. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1971. ED 061 868. MF-$0.65; HC-$9.87.

Sutherland, Gordon. "Is There an Optimum Size for a University?" *Minerva* 11 (January 1973) : 30-52.

Sutton, F. X. "African Universities and the Process of Change in Middle Africa." In *The Task of Universities in a Changing World*, edited by S. Kertesz. Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1971. Pp. 383-404.

"Swedish University Policy." *Minerva* 3 (Autumn 1964): 83-98.

‡Tapingkae, Amnuay, and Setti, Louis, eds. *Education in Thailand: Some Thai Perspectives*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

"Third European Seminar on the Democratization of Education." *Democratic Education* (1970) : 5-47.

Thompson, Kenneth W. *Higher Education for National Development: One Model for Technical Assistance*. Occasional Paper. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972.

Thomson, A. P. "Higher Education in the Colonies." *Universities Quarterly* 10 (August 1956) : 359-370.

Thwing, Charles F. *Universities of the World.* New York: Macmillan, 1911.

Tinto, Vincent. "University Organization and Scientific Productivity in Turkey." In *Comparative University Reform,* edited by P. G. Altbach. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, forthcoming.

Thomasson, Richard. "Some Observations on Higher Education in Sweden." *Journal of Higher Education* 37 (December 1966) : 493-501.

Touraine, Alain. *The May Movement: Reform and Revolt.* New York: Random House, 1971.

———. *The Academic System in American Society.* New York: McGraw-Hill, forthcoming.

Trahan, Richard G. "The Dilemma of Decentralization and Reform: Yugoslav Universities in Transition." In *Comparative University Reform,* edited by P. G. Altbach. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman, forthcoming.

Trends and Issues in Higher Education. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1970.

Trow, Martin. "The Democratization of Higher Education in America." *European Journal of Sociology* 3 (1962) : 231-262.

———. "A Question of Size and Shape: The Robbins Report on British Higher Education." *Universities Quarterly* 18 (March 1964) : 136-152.

———. "The Idea of a New University." *Universities Quarterly* 19 (March 1965) : 162-172.

———. "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education." In *The Embattled University,* edited by S. Graubard and G. Ballotti. New York: Braziller, 1970. Pp. 1-42.

———. "The Changing Meaning of Higher Education: Implications for Research." In *Research Forum on Teacher Education,* edited by G. Chanan. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1972a.

———. "The Expansion and Transformation of Higher Education." *International Review of Education* 18 (1972b) : 61-84.

Truscot, Bruce. *Red Brick University.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1951.

"UNESCO Conference of Ministers of Education of European Member States on Access to Higher Education." *Democratic Education* (1968) : 3-31.

*"Universities in Rapidly Developing Countries." In *Universities Facing the Future,* edited by W. R. Niblett and W. F. Butts. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. Pp. 61-180.

"University and Society." *Journal of Social and Political Ideas in Japan* 5 (December 1967): 117-280 (special issue).

**University Autonomy: Its Meaning Today.* Paris: International Association of Universities, 1965.

*"University Development in Nigeria: Report of the National Universities Commission." *Minerva* 3 (Winter 1965): 210-228.

University Education and Public Service. Paris: International Association of Universities, 1959.

University Grants Committee. *University Development, 1962-1967.* London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1968.

University and Its Reform: Bibliography. Brussels: European Community Institute for University Studies, 1969.

*"University Reform in France." *Minerva* 7 (Summer 1969): 706-727.

*"University Reform in Germany." *Minerva* 8 (April 1970): 242-267.

University Reform in Germany: Report by a German Commission. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1949.

*"University Reform in Japan." *Minerva* 8 (October 1970): 581-593.

University Reform in Latin America: Analyses and Documents. Leiden: International Student Conference, 1959.

*"University Reforms: 1" *Western European Education* 2 (Winter 1970-1971): 275-365.

The University Within the Education System. Papers Read to the Third General Meeting of the Comparative Education Society in Europe. Ghent: Ministry of National Education of Belgium, 1967.

Venables, Peter. "Confusion, Concentration, and Clarification in Higher Education." *Comparative Education* 2 (November 1965): 11-18.

———. "Conflicting Patterns and Purposes in Higher Education." *Universities Quarterly* 24 (Autumn 1970): 375-392.

Vesselo, Arthur. "The Italian Universities." *Universities Quarterly* 3 (February 1948): 600-610.

Veysey, Laurence. *The Making of the American University.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Vocos, F. J. *El problema universitario y el movemiento reformista.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Huemul, 1962.

von Grunebaum, G. E. "The Political Role of the University in the Near East as Illustrated by Egypt." In *Modern Islam,* edited by

G. E. von Grunebaum. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1962. Pp. 258-275.

von Rundstedt, Marianne. *Studien und Berichte: Die Studienforderung in Frankreich.* Berlin: Max Planck Gesellschaft, 1965.

von Weizsaker, C. C. "Problems in the Planning of Higher Education." *Higher Education* 1 (November 1972) : 391-401.

*Waardenburg, J. D. J. "Some Institutional Aspects of Muslim Higher Education and Their Relation to Islam." *Numen* 12 (April 1964): 96-138.

*Waggoner, Barbara; Waggoner, George; Wolfe, G. "Higher Education in Contemporary Central America." *Journal of Inter American Studies* 6 (1964) : 445-461.

Wagner, Lesley. "The Economics of the Open University." *Higher Education* 1 (May 1972) : 159-184.

Walsh, John. "France: Mass Higher Education Produces Diplomas But Not Jobs." *Science* 176 (April 1972) : 264-267.

Walters, Stewart. "University Reform: A Case Study From France." *Universities Quarterly* 18 (March 1964) : 169-179.

Walton, G. "A Language and Its Literature: The Study of English in a West African University." *Universities Quarterly* 25 (Autumn 1971) : 446-455.

*Wang, Chun. "Current Trends in the Reform of Higher Education in Communist China." *Chinese Education* 2 (Winter 1969-1970) : 27-52.

"Wastage in Higher Education." *Universities Quarterly* 25 (Spring 1971) : 122-237 (special issue) .

Watson, Charles R. "Higher Educational Institutions and Their Influences." *Muslim World* 37 (January 1947): 16-22.

Watts, A. G. *Diversity and Choice in Higher Education.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Weidner, Edward W. *The World Role of Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

*Weinberg, Ian, and Walker, Kenneth. "Student Politics and Political Systems: Toward a Typology." *American Journal of Sociology* 75 (July 1969) : 77-96.

Wieruszowski, Helene. *The Medieval University.* Princeton, New Jersey: Anvil Books, 1966.

Wildenmann, Rudolph. "Higher Education in Transition: The Case of the Universities in the Federal Republic of Germany." In *The Task of Universities in a Changing World,* edited by S. Kertesz. Notre Dame, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1971. Pp. 336-352.

Williams, Bruce. "University Values and University Organization." *Minerva* 10 (April 1972) : 259-279.

Williams, G.; Blackstone, T.; and Metcalf, D. *The Economics of University Teaching: A Case Study of a Professional Labor Market.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, forthcoming.

Wilson, Gail, and Lewis, Pamela. "Cost Studies in Higher Education." *Higher Education Review* 2 (Spring 1970) : 15-30.

*Wood, Glynn. "Planning University Reform: An Indian Case Study." *Comparative Education Review* 16 (June 1972) : 267-280.

Wood, Richard H. *U. S. Universities: Their Role in AID-Financed Technical Assistance Overseas.* New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968.

**World Survey of Education, Vol. 4, Higher Education.* Paris: UNESCO, 1966.

Yesufu, T. M., ed. *Creating the African University: Emerging Issues of the 1970s.* Ibadan: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Yip, Yat Hoong. *Role of Universities in Management Education for National Development in Southeast Asia.* Singapore: Regional Institute for Higher Education and Development, 1972.

Zahlan, A. B. "Science in the Arab Middle East." *Minerva* 8 (January 1970) : 8-35.

Znaniecki, Florian. *The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Zweig, Michael. *The Idea of the World University.* Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.

JOURNALS (The following journals feature extended coverage of higher education issues in various countries on a fairly regular basis.)

Australian Journal of Higher Education
Bulletin (International Association of Universities)
Change (U. S.)
Chinese Education
Chronicle of Higher Education (U. S.)
Comparative Education (U. K.)
Comparative Education Review
Democratic Education: IUS Journal on the Democratization and Reform of Education
Higher Education
International Educational and Cultural Exchange
Journal of Higher Education, (U. S.)

Minerva, 1962
New Frontiers in Education (India)
Soviet Education
Times Higher Education Supplement (London)
Western European Education